Donald H. Monroe James T. Moore Merl M. Moore, Jr. William H. Moore John W. Mueller, Jr. Francis X. Munisteri Edward L. Murphy, Jr. John B. Murphy, Jr., 0948683 Clive E. Murray, Jr., 0947778 Michael Nakonechny, Jr. Robert C. Nealey William J. Nelson Joseph C. Nesbitt Jack W. Nielsen John R. Nielsen, O948511 Oliver M. Nikoloff II James E. Niles Oscar F. Noss, Jr. George A. Nowak Howard W. Nunez, Jr., O958109 Thomas M. O'Hara, O954101 Robert E. Olson Frederick T. O'Neill Sidney E. Ormes, Jr. Donald M. Palmer Richard A. Palmer, O953737 Dwayne A. Panzer, O947969 George M. Paris David R. Parrish Carl R. Patterson, O954100 Noe O. Pena Edward W. Pence Oswald E. Perkins Elroy F. Perrien George E. Peters, Jr. Frank W. Philippbar Joe E. Pierce Rocco Piganell, O955684 Thelmus G. Plummer Roger D. Powell Donald B. Poynter Chesley D. Prichard, O954723 William B. Proctor, O954392 Albert B. Pyle, O955176 Jack A. Quirey Arthur J. Rafferty John R. Rarick Jay B. Rash Edward R. Ravenel III, 0958159 John L. Ray, 0947837 Roy A. Redmond Earl H. Reeg, Jr. Johnny Reus-Froylan Charles R. Rice Ronald N. Richards John L. Ridgeway, O956009 Thomas N. Ringo Carleton J. Robinson, 0961035 Haldon G. Robinson Willard B. Rogers Newman Rome William J. Ronchelli Gordon D. Rowe Everett C. Royal, 0954644 Dean L. Rumburg James W. Ryan Wallace E. Ryle John R. Saldine John R. Saldine
Paul L. Savage
Bruce K. Schmid
Arnold J. Schwartz
Charles E. Scott
Charles A. Seitz
Robert P. Selm Sherman M. Seltzer Philip L. Semsch Clarence A. Shanks Ralph L. Shannon, O954657 Robert H. Sharpe Harold E. Shaw, O957618 Dwight M. Sheldon Louis H. Shelton, O949504 John A. Shortal Charles M. Short Louis F. Siegel Donald E. Sloan George J. Small William W. Smith William R. Smithea Robert W. Spoede, O954680 James E. Stacy, O955127 Johnson L. Stambaugh

Leon B. Stayton, Jr. Donald H. Steenburn Leslie E. Stephenson
William T. Stevenson, O955940
Carroll A. St. Martin, O954454
George H. Strauss, O957642 Rufus C. Streater Leslie W. Sturdivant, 0955576 Robert C. Styslinger Mario A. Suro-Burgos Russell J. Suther, O958412 Thomas J. Sweeny William U. Sykes Charles W. Tate, Jr. William B. Taylor Charles A. Terry, O948414 Edward M. Thoben, Jr. Charles E. Thomann Harold I. Thomas John F. Thompson
John H. Thompson
John W. Timmins, Jr.
Earl N. Trabue
Robert L. Turman
Frederick C. Turner Glenn E. Turner, Jr. Lawrence M. Tuthill Lloyd S. Underhill Guinn E. Unger Willis M. Vansell Charles I. Vinikow Albert L. Walker Elwood R. Walls Edwin S. Walters John M. Walton John J. Warnke, Jr. Walter K. Waymeyer Thomas H. Webb Thomas H. Webb
Jack W. Weech
Robert E. Weigel
Doyle D. Weigner
Stanley Wesolowski, O958059
William F. West, O957219
William C. White
William E. Whitely
Joseph M. Wilhere, O954406
Edwin J. Williams, Jr.
Lonnie W. Williams, O954403
Richard A. Williams
Floyd M. Wilson, O947781 Floyd M. Wilson, O947781 Charles C. Winn Donald H. Wolcott Dudley L. S. Woods, Jr. Richard J. Woolshlager Richard J. Woolshiager Alan B. Worthington John J. Wren George Wright James C. Yadon, 0949928 Bruce C. Young Ralph K. Younger Charles B. Zumwalt, O957221

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant in the Medical Service Corps, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), effective June 15, 1949, subject to physical qualification, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army:

John R. Cross George A. Custer, O956353 Robert D. Forger Landon Garrett, Jr. Eldred E. Jones Hogan A. Randle, O949952 Virgil S. Thurlow Robert E. Ward, O949965 Donald L. Welling, O956394 Dale E. Wykoff

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 31 (legislative day of March 18), 1949:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY
The nominations of Sterrett E. Dietrich,
Medical Corps, O261907, et al., for appoint-

ment in the Medical, Dental, Medical Service, and Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) and title II of the Act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), which were confirmed today, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 24, 1949, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Sterrett E. Dietrich, which appears on page 3102.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States without specification of branch, arm, or service:

Capt. Francis John Kelly, O37505, Medical Service Corps, United States Army. Capt. Ernest Harry Wallace, O37552, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Phyllis W. Adams and other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 24, 1949, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the Congressional Record for that day under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Phyllis W. Adams, appearing on page 3103, and ending with the name of Alma Shaw Wainwright on page 3106.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy

Lewis N. Moeller

Temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the Navy Robert S. Davis

Temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy

George B. Chafee Frederick S. Hall James A. Morrison William J. O'Brien Mell A. Peterson Samuel D. Simpson Bruce E. S. Trippensee Wilfred A. Walter David L. Whelchel

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Edward E. Tate, headmaster, St. Stephen's School for Boys, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

O God of infinite power and might, the maker and ruler of all men upon the earth, we commend this Nation to the guidance of Thy wisdom and to the keeping of Thy laws. May those who have been chosen by the people to serve them carry out their sacred responsibilities in honesty and uprightness of life. May they never be allowed to forget that they are answerable, not alone to the people but to the God who knows and judges. Deliver them from the inordinate love of power and the motives of personal aggression, from the considerations of ambitious men or their influence in place of the demands of truth and justice. Bless them, O God, in their several duties with an ever larger vision of truth, an ever deeper sense of the demands of righteousness, so that through their faithfulness the life of our people may be sustained by wise policies, strengthened by good government, and lifted to a higher plane of destiny and achievement.

And, O Father, who hast appointed a day when the kingdoms of this world shall become one with the Kingdom of our Lord, inspire us all with such loyalty that we may serve Thee as Thou deservest, choosing Thy way as our own. May we be satisfied, in these days of perplexity and anxiety, with nothing less than a country at unity with itself, so that in winning our bid for freedom and fellowship we may guide the world into a larger unity of all men. All this we ask through Him who came to set men free, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3910. An act to extend for a temporary period the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act.

FEDERAL BONUS FOR SERVICE IN WORLD WAR II BY RESIDENTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1233) to provide a Federal bonus for service in World War II by residents of the District of Columbia, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each an article, one from the United Mine Workers Journal, dated March 15, and the other two from the New York Times on the United Mine Workers welfare fund.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by former Postmaster General James Farley. ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRA-TION

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of the House at this time to the fact that the bill continuing the foreign-aid program does not require American-flag participation in the carriage of ECA cargoes in trades between foreign ports and does not, therefore, make adequate provision for the use of American-flag tankers for the transportation of petroleum and petroleum products to various ECA nations. The act provides that petroleum cargoes be provided from sources outside the United States wherever practicable. Most of this transportation takes place in the so-called indirect trades, such as the movement of petroleum from Venezuela or the Persian Gulf areas to Europe. During the past year most of this transportation has been carried on by foreignflag tankers, the American-flag participation being negligible. The situation is especially bad because there is now a surplus of American-flag tanker tonnage, and the American-flag tanker fleet is threatened with wholesale lay-ups. Both the CIO and the A. F. of L. unions are concerned about the resulting unemployment.

I intended to offer an amendment to clarify this situation. However, I am informed that Mr. Hoffman has made personal assurances to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that he would make necessary readjustments to give the American-flag tanker fleet a reasonable participation in the indirect tanker movement. I shall, therefore, refrain from offering any amendment to cover that situation. I assume that under this program American-flag tankers will receive at least one-third of the indirect tanker movement business. I have full confidence in Mr. Hoffman's assurances on this point, but I desire that the House know that I am relying in this connection upon these assurances.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. McGRATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection. Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, on March 25 the Greeks all over the world celebrated Greek Independence Day, the one hundred and twenty-eighth anniversary of their freedom from the Turks who had overrun and conquered their country. I am sure the House of Representatives does not want the commemoration of this day by a great race of courageous and liberty-loving people to go unnoticed.

When we think of Greece, we are reminded of a gallant, courageous, and valiant people who, during this last World War, stood up in the face of overwhelming odds and, like the Greeks of ancient times, fought the invading and destructive hordes from the north who devastated her land and homes and slaughtered them by the thousands.

When we think of Greece, we think of Sparta and Athens, where the principles of democracy were really practiced, who ruled the world in ancient times, and who contributed so much to the civilization of the world. We think of some of the great men she produced-Demosthenes, Pericles, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Pindar, Herodotus, Themistocles, Lycurgus, and Solon, and many others renowned in their respective fields.

When we think of Greece, we think of the fine American citizens of Greek extraction who have contributed so much to the business and cultural life of this great country of ours, who are the finest type of citizens.

When we think of Greece, we think of a valiant, gallant, and courageous peo-ple who are continuing their fight for independence and democracy against the destructive hordes of communism, and surely we, as the most powerful Nation in the world, want to direct all the economic aid possible to help her in her great struggle to survive and to take her rightful place in the sun with the other nations of the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of March

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on March 24 I was granted permission by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of printing will be \$159.75. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the record in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members concerning the proposed repairs to the House Chamber, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter with an enclosure received from David Lynn, the Architect of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington News.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include newspaper editorials.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum

is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Bailey Hoffman, Mich. Riehlman Barrett, Pa. Horan Scott. Hugh D., Jr. Smith, Ohio Blatnik Jenison Bolton, Ohio Jennings Somers Stanley Bosone Judd Kearns Bulwinkle Celler Kirwan Stefan Dawson Dingell Macy Merrow Thomas, N. J. Welch, Mo. Dolliver Evins Morrison Whitaker White, Idaho Morton Fernandez Gilmer Murdock Wood Woodhouse O'Brien, Mich. O'Toole Poulson Gossett Woodruff Hall, Leonard W. Powell

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 176) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, of Connecticut, be, and she is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

REGULATION OF OLEOMARGARINE
Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call t

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority memher of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. Allen]; and pending that I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of H. R. 2023, known as the Granger bill. There was quite a little testimony before the Rules Committee to the effect that there would be a substitute bill offered, the Poage bill, and possibly another amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina IMr. Rivers] which would seek to follow still another course.

This matter of oleomargarine versus butter or butter versus oleomargarine has been kicking around in this Congress for some 15 years or more, to my personal knowledge; and altogether for some 60 years. The question that will be presented to the House today through representatives of the two opposing groups, as I understand it, would seek first, under H. R. 2023, certain types of curtailment upon the shipment of oleomargarine. The opponents of that theory of the legislation contend that that gives butter an unfair advantage. The proponents of H. R. 2023, on the other hand, contend that the dairy industry should have some Federal protec-

Under the Poage bill, which I understand will be offered, oleomargarine would not be discriminated against except that the law would require that oleomargarine be distinctly and definitely designated and marked as such, in order that the consuming public could not be misled, and would know in the first instance whether they were purchasing oleomargarine or butter.

I understand further that that bill provides that each package of oleomargarine would be required to be marked or branded as such, and that therefore the housewife or anyone who desired to purchase either commodity would know what they were purchasing when they purchased it, and that safeguards thereby would be thrown around the consuming public so that some unscrupulous merchant or dealer could not sell them oleomargarine when they thought they were purchasing butter.

Of course, in this conflict which has been waging, the advocates of the Granger bill take the position that the dairy industry should be given more protection.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one additional minute.

It is my personal thought, as one who tries to approach the matter sincerely, that if the public, the body in whom we should be primarily interested, is protected in that they know what they are purchasing, that is as far as the Congress should go. In the final analysis, this House will have an opportunity under this rule granted by the Rules Committee to pass upon the merits and demerits of the conflicting theories as they will be presented here today and possibly tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

New Jersey [Mr. Canfield] and ask unanimous consent that he may proceedout of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, have you, perchance observed the reported delight experienced by the President when he signed the rent-control bill passed by both Houses of Congress this week? Yesterday in signing the bill he said it meant effective rent control; he also went on to say that it meant a crushing defeat for the real-estate lobby. When the conference report was being debated in this House this week I asked the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in charge of the bill, very politely, I thought, this question: "Is it not true that the local option feature of the bill is obnoxious to the President of the United States?" And his answer was, "I have no reason to think so." Then he went on to say that I was injecting politics into the debate.

Let me call attention to the exact remarks made by the President in addressing the mayors' conference here in Washington on March 21. These remarks bear on the local option feature of rent control. I quote:

During recent weeks the real-estate lobby has made a concerted effort to have rent control turned over to the cities and localities. I have no doubt that the elected officials of city and local governments in most large city areas are as strongly in favor of effective rent control as I am. They know that their problems of overcrowding, relief to the needy, crime and juvenile delinquency, would be greatly increased if rent controls were removed now. The point is, however, that most cities have neither the legal authority nor the financial resources to carry out a successful program of rent control. The real-estate lobby knows this perfectly well. It wants us to turn rent control over to local authority—not in order to strengthen local authority, but in order to destroy rent control.

Mr. Speaker, both these statements, that of March 21 and that of yesterday were post-Key West statements of the President of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts, to submit a consent request.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the Record an article on the Taft-Hartley law by Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer advises it will cost \$514.75.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, notwithstanding the excess, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire. Mr. Speaker, the sole question before

Mr. Speaker, the sole question before this body is whether or not we shall support the rule, House Resolution 168, making in order consideration of the bill H. R. 2023 providing for the regulation of oleomargarine and the repeal of the tax thereon, and for other purposes.

As the gentleman from Mississippi has stated, this rule provides for 3 hours of general debate, after which time it will be open for amendment when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule.

During the Eightieth Congress this body overwhelmingly passed a bill in support of oleomargarine. I know that there is some disagreement which perhaps will be taken care of by amendments. I know that all of us are not in complete agreement in regard to what the bill should contain, but I do feel that everyone should support this rule to bring the bill before this body for consideration, and I therefore ask the Members to support the rule.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Sabath], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there will be no opposition to the rule now before us because I think we are all in favor of passing legislation affecting the present tax on oleomargarine. As I have said many times on this floor, I believe it is manifestly unfair to put a tax on a substitute for butter because the poor people cannot afford to buy butter.

I hope that when the bill is taken up and during the 3 hours of general debate thereon, it will be made clear that we want a fair bill, one that will not mislead the public in any instance; that the packages will be properly marked so that no one can be imposed upon; that the housewives and the people who are obliged to eat in restaurants will not be misled and be served oleo instead of butter.

Some of the gentlemen representing rural districts have stated they are fearful this legislation will affect the farmer. Everything that goes into the manufacture and production of oleomargarine is really grown on the farm, whether it is milk, tallow, lard, soybeans, and even the oil. These products are all produced on the farm.

In view of conditions today, there should not be any opposition, as I have said, to this bill because it is bound to relieve those unfortunate people who cannot afford to buy butter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. A good many times during the last 12 years I have heard the gentleman from Illinois stand up here in the well and state what a good friend of the farmer he has been and that he has always supported farm legislation.

Mr. SABATH. I have.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed and astounded at the gentleman standing up here now and fighting for the oleo manufacturers of America against the dairy farmers of America.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman either did not hear what I said or did not understand me. I honestly believe this bill will aid the farmer. It may not help the butter makers or those dairies that devote themselves to the manufacture of butter, but the repeal of the extant tax will definitely aid the masses of people in the United States who live on a budget. But in view of the outrageously

high prices that have been imposed upon the American people in the last year, and even up to now, where people are obliged to pay a dollar a pound for butter, I think this bill will deter them from holding up the consumers of our country. As it is, this legislation cannot in any way affect the farmers or the milk producers. are getting very high prices for milk, for cream, for cheese, and for butter. Now let the users, the customers, have a chance to obtain a substitute for a reasonable price without paying 10 cents a pound tax on it and, at the same time, without taxing the businessmen and the dealers who are selling oleomargarine. I would deplore it exceedingly if the oleomargarine people would try to take advantage of it in any way and increase the price of oleo. If they do, I shall be the first one that will criticize them and fight to protect the masses, for I shall always defend what I honestly believe is right.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. August H. Andresen].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, there should be no misunderstanding about the merits or the demerits of the controversy between oleomargarine and butter. I am for this bill. I would have preferred to have seen a stronger bill reported by the committee, one that would have prohibited the yellow coloring of oleomargarine throughout the country. But, with all legislation we generally find it is a matter of compromise, and the Granger bill which was adopted by the committee is a compromise measure. It virtually had the unanimous support of the Committee on Agriculture, one of the great committees of the House. I think I am safe in saying that 24 Members voted for reporting the Granger bill as we have it before us today, and only three voted against it. So, today it comes before you as a compromise measure which I am supporting, and which I believe should receive the overwhelming support of the Members of the House.

I have taken this time to give some explanation about the bill and to discuss the factors involved in the controversy. The Granger bill repeals all Federal tax and license fees on the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. It removes the manufacturer's tax, the wholesaler's tax, and the retail tax, and taxes on oleo, itself. That was the controversy last year and in other sessions of Congress when the same subject was before us.

Secondly, it permits under the States'-rights rule the power of the State to say whether or not yellow oleomargarine should be sold within the State. For those who believe in States' rights, why there you have a strict States'-rights proposition which you can well embrace to the fullest extent.

Thirdly, it prohibits the shipment of yellow-colored oleomargarine in interstate commerce. That is the main prohibition in the bill.

Now, some have objected to that because they do not have any oleomargarine factories within their respective States. Well, I can assure those who feel that way that should their State allow yellow-colored oleo to be sold within the State, it will not take long for the oleomargarine industry to get a factory in there.

The provisions of the bill do not weaken, modify, or repeal any part of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act insofar as the provisions of that act are applicable to oleomargarine which has been introduced in interstate commerce.

Last year, as I have said, the fight was over the question of taxes. All sides are now agreed that the tax should be repealed. The dairy farmers of the country through their organizations have agreed to the repeal of the tax. They have also agreed to the proposition that yellow-colored oleomargarine shall not be sold in interstate commerce, leaving it to the States to determine whether or not a particular State shall permit the sale of yellow-colored oleomargarine within the State. There are approximately 18 States that have laws prohibiting the sale of yellow-colored oleomargarine: New York, Pennsylvania, and a good many other States throughout the North.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is the gentleman going to put the list of those States in the RECORD?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I shall be very glad to put the list of those States in the Record.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. I wonder if the gentleman would state the content of margarine and where the products come from, so that the RECORD may show that, too.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will be glad to do that, and I can do it very briefly.

Some years ago when Paul V. McNutt was the head of the Federal Security Agency, which had jurisdiction over the Pure Food and Drug Act, a ruling was made legalizing the manufacture of oleomargarine out of cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and other vegetable oils. That regulation also permitted that oleo could be flavored with a butter flavor so that it would taste like butter. It also permitted the injection of vitamin A in the form of shark's liver oil. So that oleo today under those regulations would appear to have the same nutritive value as butter and taste like butter, and also have the same texture as butter. Of course, those vegetable fats are churned in skim milk. The only thing left is the color yellow, because we have agreed to repeal the tax. That is what the fight is over here, and that is an economic fight.

The metropolitan newspapers and the big magazines of the country are, of course, all on the oleo side. Why? If you have read the papers, and I am sure you have, and seen the large oleomargarine advertisements, you will recall that the Saturday Evening Post last week had a full-page ad by Lever Bros. Lever Bros. bought out the oldest oleomargarine factory in the country, Jelke, of Chicago, and paid \$16,000,000 for

it, so they are now one of the big operators. Those of you who are familiar with Lever Bros. know that Lever Bros. is just a subsidiary company of Uni-Lever Co., one of the biggest companies, that operates over the world and controls the price and supply of fats throughout the world. Lever Bros. alone in 1948 spent \$15,000,000 in advertising. The industry itself, as reported in the magazine which represents the advertiser, states that the oleomargarine industry to advertise oleomargarine spent \$6,000,000 in 1947 and in 1948 \$5,300,000. Then they have had millions of dollars worth of free advertising from all the discussions in Congress, debates on radio broadcasts and forums, and favorable news and editorial comment. The newspapers of the country have been the beneficiaries of the funds received for advertising from all the oleomargarine companies, which manufacture and sell oleo as well as other products. I estimate the total amount that the national magazines, metropolitan newspapers and other newspapers have received for advertising is from \$50,000,000 to \$75,000,-000 in 1948. I am not criticizing thatnot at all. I do not criticize that at all, because that is good business. But I would like to point out the reasons why the metropolitan newspapers and magazines will not give the dairy farmers any publicity. The oleo industry receives all of the favorable news and editorial com-You now know the reason. ment.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. SHAFER. I believe it would be interesting to the membership if the gentleman from Minnesota would also point out that many of these manufacturers and others who are interested in this oleomargarine legislation last year made considerable profit as a result of the increase in the market price of the various raw materials used in making oleomargarine.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I expect to do that when we get to the bill. but I am glad that the gentleman called

my attention to it.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is an economic fight. I tried to point out to you why the big newspapers of the country are all on the side of the oleomargarine industry. Here is some comment on what appeared in the Washington Post. It says "Once again the Washington Post comes through with a pretty solid editorial to the advantage of the margarine industry. I am sure you will want to pass this along to those interested." I have other letters from the Tampa Daily Times, from a paper down in Tulsa, from the National Citizen-all calling attention to that industry and giving favorable editorial comment. Why? Because those companies spend thousands and thousands-yes, millions of dollars with these newspapers and magazines for advertising.

Of course, we expect that the newspapers and magazines will support the oleomargarine industry in the issue that is now before us. The National Association of Margarine Manufacturers in a report to the soybean industry says, to the second largest customers for soybean oils-nutritious margarine. Then it goes on to say how they are advancing the cause of the soybean people so that they can sell more soybeans for use in oleomargarine.

Let me point out to you again why this is an economic fight. Who will profit most by it? Of course, the oleomargarine industry will profit. We find now that instead of there being 28 large multimillion-dollar oleomargarine factories in this country, that number has been reduced to 24 big oleo manufacturers. They are out now to get legislation to increase the unrestricted sale of oleomargarine colored vellow to imitate butter. and to steal the butter market away from the two and one-half million dairy farmers in the United States, all for the purpose of making more money.

They are using the housewives of the United States and the poor people as fronts to gain their objective. Of course, they are selfish, and of course we here, too, have a right to be selfish to protect a large segment of our American agricultural economy, namely two and one-half million dairy farmers.

The historic color of butter is yellow. The oleomargarine industry can take any other color under the sun, excepting yellow, without paying a cent of tax; but they want yellow, to make their product look like butter, to increase their market, to deceive the people, and when they get that color, to go out and capture the entire spread market, because they can sell their product at a lower price.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. the gentleman verify the statement I make when I say that for every pound of oleomargarine produced 11 quarts of milk are lost in production?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I believe the gentleman is correct. I will discuss that more in detail a little later

in general debate.

Of course, the cotton and soybean farmers claim they have a stake in yellow oleo. Every witness who was before our committee from the soybean industry-and a good friend of mine from Minnesota was there in behalf of soybeans, and he said that if they could color oleomargarine yellow and have it sold throughout the country he expected to increase his market for soybeans. Of course, the cotton farmers expect to increase their market for cottonseed oil. The best customers that the cotton farmer has are the dairy farmers of the United States who buy all of their cotton goods, who buy cottonseed meal from the cotton producers of the South. ton industry expects that if yellow oleomargarine takes the place of butter it will get a greater price for its product and sell more of it because then it will capture the spread market.

Strange as it may seem, no one from the oleomargarine industry came before our committee to testify as a witness: not a single one. Yet the committee room was filled with lawyers, lobbyists, representatives of the oleomargarine industry, who were there during the entire week of the hearings, but they did not offer to testify in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So let me reiterate that this is an economic fight. It is a fight against one industry, an agricultural group in the United States, against the largest segment in American agriculture, 2,500,000 dairy farmers. For myself, if I have to take a choice of going with 24 oleomargarine manufacturers and 2.500,000 Americans who are contributing to the welfare of American life, give me the American

dairy farmers.

I have always found that the industries of this country, as a rule, unless they are legislated out of business, will take care of themselves. I have also found that when it comes to charging for the products that they produce they will charge virtually all the traffic will bear, depending upon the competition. When my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Sabath], stated that he hoped the oleomargarine industry would not charge more for yellow-colored oleomargarine if they won this battle he does not need to deceive himself. He might as well have his eyes opened right now, because the oleomargarine industry will charge just as much as they can get to move their product.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will

the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. ABERNETHY. Is that not just what the butter people want them to do?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well. they are already doing it. You can buy white oleomargarine in Washington for 22 cents a pound, and you will also pay 43 cents a pound for yellow-colored oleomargarine, which is considerably more than the 10-cent tax.

I urge the adoption of the rule and

support for the Granger bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah

[Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, we are discussing a very important piece of legislation today. I am in a very peculiar situation. The gentleman who just preceded me, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. August H. Andresen], referred to me as the worst New Dealer there is in existence. I ordinarily refer to him as the worst Republican I know of. But on this issue we find ourselves together.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am afraid I did not make myself understood by the gentleman, because I have the highest regard for him, for his ability and integrity in dealing with American problems, and I admire him for the stand he has taken, notwithstanding some of the opposition which comes from the floor of the House. So I want to say to the gentleman that I have the highest regard for him, and if he interprets my remarks as having called him a rank New Dealer, then he misunderstood what I had to say.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will

the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I understood the gentleman, and he understood what I said about him. Now, I have not time to yield further.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has come before the House from the great Committee on Agriculture by a vote of 24 to 3. I do not want to mislead anybody into thinking that that was the division in the committee; it was not. The committee was divided with one exception absolutely on the division of the country on the Mason and Dixon's line; those who were below it were on one side of this question. All of those who were above it, with the exception of one, were on the other side of the question. This ought to indicate to everybody here that it is an economic question.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say something to my colleagues here. I have always been a New Dealer, I have always been favorable to labor. I have fought side by side with you boys on all occasions who believe in the same things as I do, and on this instance you cannot accuse me of being other than sincere and honest; it is not my intention to put anything over on anybody. Before this debate is over I hope we shall have a clear

understanding.

It is going to be said here this afternoon before we get through that my bill is not in harmony with the Democratic platform, that it is not in harmony with what the President wants. But I want to tell you that I am one Democrat who when he runs with the crowd once in every 2 years does not run out on them

the rest of the time.

This plank on the removal of oleo taxes was in the Democratic platform. I was on the Democratic platform committee. This issue was before the com-There was a very prominent mittee man on the committee, the former mayor of Minneapolis. We knew what we were doing when we adopted that plank and kept out of it the provisions that had to do with color but held in there the provision of removing the taxes, and in harmony with the Democratic platform we are removing all the taxes from colored oleomargarine. Certainly I would not argue that it meets in toto, but it does in part, the provisions of the platform; and I imagine that if we go this far in this bill our action will be a pretty good criterion to judge what we will do with the other planks in our platform. I wanted to say that in order to give the background behind this question. It is a provision of the Democratic platform, and I promised the leadership this bill would be brought out of the committee in spite of the fact that we had the votes there to have kept it in the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Utah has

expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. In good faith, this is what this legislation proposes, and let there be no mistake about it: It prohibits the sale and transportation of colored margarine or margarine colored yellow in interstate commerce. It removes all of the taxes, however, and it sets up a white oleo for transportation. It prohibits the sale and transportation of colored oleo in interstate commerce. It provides that if a plant is located in any State where the law permits its sale, if my bill becomes law, you can sell colored oleo to your heart's content. That would be a matter for the State to determine and that is what this bill does. In other words, it shifts the responsibility back to the States.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Sabath] could pass all of these bills and you could not sell colored oleo in the State of Illinois, you could not sell it in the State of Ohio, you could not sell it in the State of Pennsylvania, you could not sell it in the State of New York, you could not sell it in the State of Connecticut, you could not sell it in the State of Connecticut, you could not sell it in the State of Maine, you could not sell it in many other States of the Union. Until those States remove their prohibitionary laws, any legislation that we may pass here is absolutely ineffective.

This bill is a compromise. It is not as restrictive as I would like, but it is a compromise and I am willing to go along with the legislation; but I shall oppose the so-called Rivers bill that we had with us before and I will oppose the Poage bill

I hope the Members of the House will consider the necessity of preserving the great dairy industry that is the last and final bulwark of sustaining and maintaining the family-sized farms in these United States. If you destroy those you destroy the very last anchor to which this old accustomed agricultural pursuit is tied, one that has been with us for the past 150 years. Anything that will deprive the farmer of the sale of his dairy products is just that much nearer to destroying this great industry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Utah has

expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are already getting confused as to what is before the House. This is not a question of what phase of agriculture you are going to help.

There are only two problems, two principles, involved in this legislation. The first is that every citizen of the United States has the right to spend his money to buy any wholesome food product for which he or she wants to spend his or her money. The second is that any citizen who spends his or her money has a right to know that he gets what he thinks he is buying.

The bill, H. R. 3, referred to by the last speaker as the Poage bill, provides for repeal of the taxes and discrimination against the sale of all kinds of margarine and allows the sale of margarine in any color or in any form in any State where the State laws allow it, provided only that it is identified in each individual package or serving. So that with the passage of H. R. 3, and not with the passage of H. R. 2023, would it be possible for the American consumer to buy

oleomargarine in any form that he or she wants to, subject to the State laws, Only by the passage of H. R. 3 have you any protection in the world in a public eating place against the serving of margarine as butter. I submit those two things are fundamental. I submit that the 140,000,000 consumers in America have a higher priority on your consideration than have either the butter bloc. the cottonseed people, or the soybean people. I submit that the consumers of America are the people who really have an interest in this question, and I submit that H. R. 2023 denies to the public the right to buy a wholesome food in a form in which the public wants I submit that H. R. 2023 denies the public protection to which they are entitled in a public eating place.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Morris].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House the fact that before dawn yesterday a very destructive tornado struck two communities in my congressional district, killing and injuring a number of people and doing great property damage. These two communities involve the towns of Canton and Longdale in Blaine County, Okla. I know that all of you join me in expressing sincere regret and sorrow in learning of this disaster and in extending our sympathies to all those who have suffered in any way by reason of this terrible windstorm.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is an old controversy, one which has existed for more than 60 years. I do not suppose that anything new will be said during the course of this debate.

Back in 1943 our committee held extensive hearings and, at that time, we had 64 witnesses that appeared before the committee and gave statements both for and against the legislation. I think by far a majority of the witnesses testified in favor of repealing the tax. In the Eightieth Congress we had further extensive hearings. At that time 67 witnesses appeared in connection with the legislation. We had before the committee 47 different bills dealing with oleomargarine and Federal taxes on oleomargarine. Now we have before us the Granger bill which does not do what its authors contend it does. The original sponsors of that type of legislation intended deliberately to outlaw yellow margarine in both intrastate and interstate commerce, but because of the fact that they were rather hard-pressed for votes in the committee they made a concession and stated that they were willing for

their bill to apply only to interstate commerce. But, as a matter of fact the language now in the bill, according to an interpretation placed upon it by the people who will be charged with its enforcement, means that it does apply both to interstate and intrastate commerce.

I understand that the authors of the bill are willing to accept amendments, if necessary, to make the pending bill applicable only to interstate shipments.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. What the gentleman has said is true, but we were not hardpressed for votes, we were trying to get together with the rest of the committee and to make it agreeable to them. We had already passed this bill, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. COOLEY, I understand you had passed the bill, but if you were not hardpressed I do not see how you could have gotten the bill out, because the vote in the committee is no secret, it was 13 to 14 in favor of the Granger bill. That has been published in all the papers. Then when they were going to report the Granger bill, 23 members voted to report it, because they wanted this matter brought to the floor of the House for final determination

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will

the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentle-

man from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it not also true that the Granger bill was materially amended before they were able to get even a 14 to 13 majority vote on it?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Does not the gentleman feel that the greatest bone of contention in this whole issue has been removed from this bill by advocating taking the tax off oleo?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I do not think anything of the kind.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, It was the point of greatest controversy.

Mr. COOLEY. That is no longer in controversy. Everybody concedes now that the Federal tax should be removed.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. On the intent of the original authors, I read from page 601 of the transcript of the record, in which it is shown that I asked the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. August H. Andresen], "You"-referring to his bill, which was identical with the Granger bill-"would cover intrastate transactions." The record shows that the gentleman from Minnesota answered, "It will cover any oleomargarine that moves in commerce, whether it is interstate or intrastate.'

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is some question about H. R. 3 on the same point, but may I say to the gentleman, in view of the amendments that were agreed to, that when the Granger bill was offered the gentleman from Minnesota understood that it might be necessary to offer amendments to make it coincide with the intent of the bill, for it to be accepted by the committee. The amendments are here. I have them and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] has them. They will be offered to make the bill coincide with the intent.

Mr. COOLEY. I stated substantially

that a moment ago.

The situation before us is this: As I see it, we have three propositions. The first is to adopt the Granger bill, which outlaws yellow oleo only in interstate commerce, and that is all, other than to repeal the taxes, which is provided in all the other bills.

The next proposition is to adopt the Poage bill, which does provide almost every conceivable protection for the dairy industry and for the public at large.

The third alternative is not to adopt either the Granger bill or the Poage bill but to pass a bill which has one purpose.

and that is to repeal the tax.

My good friend from Utah said a moment ago that he did not believe in running out on platforms and programs, and he reminded us of the fact that he was a member of the platform committee. fact is that the Democratic platform came out for repeal of the tax, and that is where it stopped. Certainly my friend from Utah did not sit in with his colleagues in writing that program and agree with them that he would go before the country on the Democratic platform providing for the repeal of the tax, and at the same time say, "I am coming to Congress, and I am going to outlaw the thing upon which the tax is levied." That is what we are doing. Are you going to vote to outlaw a very wholesome food that is consumed by a large group of our people?

This is not legislation in behalf of agriculture, it is not legislation in behalf of the cotton farmer, and it is not legislation against the dairy farmer. Certainly, coming from an agricultural section. I have the interest of the dairy farmer at heart just as much as I do the interest of the cotton farmer. But this is to remove a nuisance tax, a punitive tax, a discriminatory tax which has been imposed upon this wholesome food product for more than 60 years. The President of the United States recommends the removal of it. Now, who is running out on whom? If I stand here and tell you that I intend to vote to repeal this tax, and everybody here I suppose now agrees that it should be repealed, what has been accomplished if we repeal the tax and then outlaw yellow oleomargarine?

So far as the question of who is running out on whom is concerned, we had consumer groups from practically every city in the country before our committee. There were labor groups, the CIO and the A. F. of L., and every labor organization in America. We had prac-

tically all of the consumer organizations and all of the civic organizations.

I wish you had the time to look at the record that has been made. This is not something sponsored merely by a bunch of cotton farmers.

Mr. GRANGER. Why do you not read the record?

Mr. COOLEY. It is all here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not pres-The Doorkeeper will close the doors. the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 382, nays 9, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 59] YEAS-382

Abbitt Case, N. J. Forand Abernethy Addonizio Case, S. Dak. Cavalcante Ford Frazier Albert Celler Fugate Fulton Allen, Calif. Chatham Allen, Ill. Allen, La. Chelf Furcolo Gamble Chiperfield Andersen. Garmatz Christopher H. Carl Gary Gathings Anderson, Calif. Chudoff Andresen, August H. Church Clemente Gavin Gillette Andrews Clevenger Golden Goodwin Coffey Cole, Kans. Angell Arends Gordon Aspinall Colmer Gore Gorski, Ill. Auchincloss Bailey Barden Cooley Gorski, N. Y. Cooper Graham Baring Barrett, Wyo. Corbett Granahan Cotton Granger Bates, Ky. Bates, Mass. Cox Grant Crawford Green Battle Crook Gregory Beall Beckworth Crosser Cunningham Gwinn Bennett, Fla. Bennett, Mich. Dague Hagen Hale Davenport Davies, N. Y. Davis, Ga. Davis, Tenn. Davis, Wis. Bentsen Hall. Biemiller Edwin Arthur Hall, Bishop Leonard W. Halleck Blackney Bland Dawson Blatnik Deane Hand DeGraffenried Harden Boggs, Del. Boggs, La. Delaney Hardy Bolling Bolton, Md. Denton D'Ewart Hare Harris Bonner Dollinger Harrison Bramblett Dondero Hart Breen Donohue Harvey Havenner Hays, Ark. Hays, Ohio Hébert Brooks Douglas Brown, Ga. Brown, Ohio Doyle Durham Bryson Buchanan Eaton Eberharter Heffernan Heller Buckley, N. Y. Burdick Elliott Herlong Ellsworth Herter Heselton Elston Engel, Mich. Engle, Calif. Burke Burleson Hill Hinshaw Burnside Burton Evins Hobbs Byrne, N. Y. Fallon Hoeven Hoffman, Ill. Camp Feighan Canfield Fellows Holifield Cannon Fenton Holmes Carlyle Fernandez Hope Fisher Horan Howell Carnahan

Flood

Carroll

Huber St. George Miles Miller, Calif. Miller, Md. Sanborn Irving Jackson, Calif. Jackson, Wash. Sasscer Mille Scott, Hardie Monroney Jacobs Scott, Hugh D., Jr. Morgan Morris James Scrivner Javits Jenkins Morton Scudder Moulder Shafer Jennings Jensen Multer Short Sikes Murdock Johnson Murphy Murray, Tenn. Murray, Wis. Simpson, Ill. Jonas Jones, Ala. Jones, Mo. Jones, N. C. Simpson, Pa. Sims Smathers Nelson Smith, Kans. Smith, Va. Smith, Wis. Karst Nicholson Karsten Nixon Noland Norblad Kearney Spence Keating Norton Staggers O'Brien, Ill. Kee Keefe O'Hara, Ill. Stigler O'Neill O'Sullivan Stockman Sullivan Kelley Keogh Kilburn O'Toole Sutton Pace Kilday Taber King Passman Tackett Patman Talle Tauriello Klein Patten Kriise Kunkel Patterson Taylor Perkins Lane Teague Lanham Peterson Thomas, Tex. Pfeifer, Joseph L. Pfeiffer, William L. Thompson Thornberry Tollefson Larcade Latham LeCompte LeFevre Towe Philbin Lemke Phillips, Calif. Lesinski Underwood Van Zandt Velde Lichtenwalter Phillips, Tenn. Pickett Lind Linehan Plumley Vinson Poage Lodge Vorys Wadsworth Lovre Polk Potter Wagner Poulson Lyle Walsh Lynch McCarthy Preston Price Walter Weichel Welch, Calif. Werdel McConnell McCormack Priest Quinn Rabaut McCulloch Wheeler McDonough Rains Ramsay White, Calif. Whitten McGregor Whittington Wickersham Rankin Redden Reed, Ill. Reed, N. Y. McKinnon McMillan, S. C. McMillen, Ill. Wier Wigglesworth McSweeney Mack, Ill. Rees Williams Rhodes Wilson, Okla. Mack, Wash. Magee Ribicoff Rich Richards Wilson, Tex. Winstead Mahon Mansfield Riehlman Wolcott Marcantonio Rivers Wolverton Marsalis Rodino Wood Rogers, Fla. Rogers, Mass. Marshall Woodhouse Martin, Iowa Martin, Mass. Worley Yates Sabath Mason Sadlak Young Meyer Zablocki Sadowski Michener NAYS-9

Miller, Nebr. Byrnes, Wis. O'Hara, Minn. O'Konski Curtis Hull

Secrest Wilson, Ind. Withrow

NOT VOTING-

Hoffman, Mich. O'Brien, Mich. Barrett, Pa. Bolton, Ohio Powell Jenison Judd Regan Sheppard Smith, Ohio Kearns Boykin Buckley, Ill. Bulwinkle Kennedy Kerr Kirwan Somers Stanley Cole, N. Y. Coudert McGrath Stefan Thomas, N. J. Macy Dingell Dolliver Madden Vursell Welch, Mo. Whitaker Merrow Mitchell Fogarty Gilmer White, Idaho Woodruff Gossett Norrell Hedrick

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following

On this vote:

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Stefan against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Gossett with Mr. Macy. Mr. Welch of Missouri with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Jenison.

Mr. Regan with Mr. Kearns. Mr. Stanley with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Whitaker with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.

Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Judd. Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Coudert.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. WITHROW and Mr. WILSON of Indiana changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2023, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke briefly, when the rule was under consideration, and referred at that time to the fact that the Democratic platform provided for outright repeal of taxes on oleomargarine. I do not want the membership of the House to feel for one moment that I regard this issue as a partisan issue. The truth is that it is entirely nonpartisan. I suppose that the authors of at least half of the bills-47 in number-which were referred to our committee, are members of the Republican Party. The same thing was true in the Eightieth Congress. Out of the number of bills at that time, half came from each side of the aisle.

With reference to the bill before us now, I would like to read this paragraph from a letter which I received signed by Mr. Roger W. Jones, assistant director of legislative reference, from the office of Mr. Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

The paragraph reads, as follows:

Enactment of section 3 of H. R. 1703, and the identical bill H. R. 2023, prohibiting the manufacture, transportation, possession, sale, use, or serving of yellow oleomargarine, except the use of yellow oleomargarine in private homes, would virtually nullify the effect of repealing the tax on oleomargarine. Consequently these prohibitions are not in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No doubt that letter was written before the committee acted on H. R. 2023. gentleman does not know the date of that letter, but the legislation has been changed since that letter was written.

Mr. COOLEY. The letter was written after the Granger bill was reported. The Granger bill has been changed in part, that is true, but I want to refer to another paragraph in this letter. I might state that the letter itself indicates

clearly that the Administrator will regard the bill as being applicable to both interstate and intrastate shipments and sales of oleomargarine. Under the bill which is before us, no protection is provided for the public against possible fraud. I want to say to the membership of the House that I have many constituents engaged in the dairy business. I have many close personal friends in that business. I want to say further I was proud of one witness who appeared before our committee, who came from North Carolina. I am proud, further, of the fact that dairy herds are now being grazed in the State of North Carolina 365 days of the year, and further that it is not necessary to artificially color butter which is manufactured in North Carolina. The truth is, I am anxious to provide every protection for the public against fraud growing out of the sale of oleomargarine.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. In just a moment I will vield.

I met with the dairymen of North Carolina in the city of Raleigh before I came to Washington and discussed this proposition with them. I told them they might as well accept the fact that this tax was going to be repealed, and they agreed. Then they put forth the proposition that the sale of yellow oleomargarine should be outlawed both in intrastate and interstate commerce. I told them that in my opinion the Congress of the United States would never take such drastic action as that, but that I was perfectly willing to provide every possible protection to prevent fraud upon the public.

The Poage bill contains just about every possible protection you can conceive, whereas the Granger bill does not even purport to prevent fraud. It does not purport to protect the public. It only makes it unlawful to ship yellow oleomargarine across State lines, but once it is across the State line, there is nothing in this bill to prevent it being sold as butter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield. Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask my distinguished chairman, realizing the statement he has just made, how he can take that position when for 25 years we have had the socalled filled-milk law on the statute books, which does the same thing and gives the same protection to the evaporated-milk people that the Granger bill does to the butter people? The Federal Government does not have the responsibility of seeing whether the people in those States who use filled milk are defrauded or not. It is left to the people of the States that make it-that is Indiana and Illinois.

Mr. COOLEY. We are not dealing now with filled milk. We are dealing with oleomargarine.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But the same principle applies.

Mr. COOLEY. The same principle may apply, but the matter before us to determine is whether or not we are going to enact a Federal law making it a crime for the housewife to transport yellow-colored oleomargarine across a State line. Should oleo be put in a category along with narcotics, liquor, and other products of that kind?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Well, put it in the same category as filled milk. Would the gentleman repeal the filled-

milk law?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not taking any position on that right now. I am willing to consider the matter when the gentleman brings it before the committee.

I wish I had time to read these letters pertaining to the legislation now under consideration, but I will ask permission to incorporate them in my extension of remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. · Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2023, a bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

In the Eightieth Congress I became deeply interested in the dairy industry's fight against unfair competition. This was natural, as the Twenty-ninth Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent, is one of the largest dairy districts in the great State of New York, and for that matter in the Notion

The total value of the dairy products sold in the Twenty-ninth District of New York was \$244,060,082 in 1 year. In other words, the dairy industry is by far the largest industry in the district and any loss that it suffers and any falling off in its revenue will have an immediate effect on every merchant in the district, including the grocer who sells oleomargarine.

It has been said, and with some reason and logic, that it is unfair to tax colored oleo, that it is unfair to the poor man who cannot afford butter, but who likes to have colored margarine because he can then kid himself that it is butter.

Of course, we live in an age of substitutes, and, although there is a well-known advertisement that says, "It's fun to be fooled, but it's better to know," most of us much prefer to be fooled.

Now, this bill repeals the tax on oleomargarine entirely, but insists that it be uncolored; that it be sold for and looking like what it is, and what its proponents claim it is—pure virgin white, without any taint of animal fat—that horrid thought. Well, what is wrong with that? What is wrong with pure white, unadulterated, uncolored margarine? The answer is, nothing at all, unless—and here suspicion raises its ugly head—unless it is desired to pass oleomargarine off as butter.

This is an easy thing to do, and it is being done in hotels, schools, and institutions all over this country at this very moment.

The opponents of the bill have come up with the highly unoriginal suggestion of having a law passed that would oblige any public eating place serving oleo to have a conspicuous sign announcing the fact to the customers. How would this law be enforced? Maybe some of you can remember the prohibition era. would be enforced by appointing another board or commision paid for by the taxpayer, and incidentally the dairy farmers, under the executive branch, of This would create another regicourse. ment of Federal bureaucrats who would snoop around to see that the law was

I need hardly tell you that these bureaucrats would have their friends and their enemies, some of them in vulgar political parlance could and would be reached. We would have nothing but an expensive exhibition of confusion worse confounded.

This simple measure obviates all this. It prohibits the movement of yellow oleo in interstate commerce. It removes all Federal taxes, and best of all, it permits the States to regulate oleo manufacture and sale within their own borders. Some of us are jealous of States' rights: I confess to a slight leaning toward that school of thought. Some of us want to get away from everlasting bigness, the impersonality of size, the octopus-like quality of it. Some of us believe we can conduct our own business better than the Federal Government can conduct it for us. Some of us would like to be allowed to go to perdition in our own way, but that is probably too much to ask.

Just the other day it was announced that the Government had to support butter prices in Minnesota at 59 cents per pound, so the industry is now beginning to feel the depression that is beginning to appear in many places.

It will be a sad day for this country and the world if our cow population diminishes further and the dairy industry goes into a real decline.

This bill is not asking for any appropriation. It is not hurting or preventing the sale of margarine which we acknowledge to be a good, healthful, cheap substitute.

All it does is prevent the butter industry from having to fight unfair competition. The price of butter is always going to be the key to the prosperity of the dairy industry, because it is the only economic way of storing milk in the flush season. All milk prices are inevitably tied to the price of butter.

Mr. Chairman, this is an eminently just and fair bill; it is reasonable; it brings this question down to the State level where it belongs. It merely protects the great dairy industry from unfair competition, the only kind of competition that can destroy it.

We heard a lot on the floor of this House yesterday about Hungry Horse. Mr. Chairman, it will be a sad day for this country when this House hears about hungry cows.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, something was said today about the Democratic platform. I want to tell the members of the committee that the plank in the Democratic platform which proposes repeal of the Federal antimargarine tax means just what it says. I think I know something about that plan. I was a member of the drafting subcommittee that drafted the Democratic platform as a member of the general committee on platforms and resolutions. We conducted a week of hearings on that platform, and we heard many tell us their views on the oleomargarine situation. The proposal on margarine that we drafted meant repeal of the Federal antimargarine legislation-repeal of license fees and taxes. Nothing more was said about it. There was no thought of substituting a ban on the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine in interstate commerce or of putting any other restriction on margarine in lieu of taxes. Those who now argue that the administration would be breaking faith with Midwest farmers or any other farmers if it goes ahead with repeal of the taxes on margarine, evidently do not know what went on at Philadelphia when the Democratic platform was drafted.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will

the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. It is true the gentleman was on the original platform committee, but certainly he was not on the last committee when we worked until 3 o'clock in the morning on this plank in the platform and I challenge the gentleman to read what the platform says.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to enter into any controversy with the gentleman. I was in Philadelphia and attended every single solitary meeting of all committees concerning the drafting and the acceptance of the platform before it was placed before the rank-and-file Democratic delegates from throughout the Nation in Convention Hall. I defy the gentleman, for whom I have the most profound respect, to point to a single word in any of the deliberations whatsoever which indicated by even a fair inference that the Democratic platform said anything other than just the repeal of the taxes on oleomargarine. It certainly said nothing to the effect that colored oleomargarine shall not be permitted to go into the stream of interstate commerce and anyone who argues to the contrary flies in the face of the actual facts. I am more than happy to be here this morning to indicate the exact situation. All that was done was to say in that platform, "Repeal the All this other business dragged in here is a facade to hide the shenanigans of the dairy interests. They now, when cowed and licked, belatedly come out and say, "Yes; we want to repeal all of the taxes on yellow oleomargarine, but prevent yellow oleo from crossing State lines." How silly. If yellow oleo is good in intrastate commerce, why should it, ipso facto, be treated as poison, and thus verboten, when shipped across State lines. If yellow oleo is good for John Q. Public in New York, why should it not be sent without hindrance into New Jersey to GI Joe?

If oleomargarine in one State is wholesome and pure, nutritious and good, by what sort of abracadabra does it become just the reverse when it is shipped into another State? That does not enter my cranium as common sense and I cannot conceive of it being logical. Therefore the pending bill is a farce. It is a smoke screen to protect improperly the American Dairy Association and the like.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentle-

man from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As one of the distinguished Members of this body for many years, and being now chairman of the Judiciary Committee, may I ask the gentleman if he would be willing to repeal the law in connection with filled milk which is based upon the

same principle?

Mr. CELLER. One has nothing to do with the other. We are concerned with oleomargarine, not with milk. I will say this, not necessarily in direct answer, because the question is utterly irrelevant, incompetent, and immaterial, as they say in court, if you are going to place penalties upon the use of colored oleomargarine then let the sauce for the goose be sauce for the gander. You know, you gentlemen from the dairy States, that you must color butter, especially in the wintertime.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, no. Mr. CELLER. Oh, yes, sir; in the wintertime you color butter. Because of the inability of the cattle to eat the grass, the green of which makes the butter yellow, you come to the inescapable result that fully 80 or more percent of the butter made in the wintertime must be colored. Now I ask you, if you are going to color oleomargarine, and then compel it to bear a penalty, why should you not put the same penalty upon butter when it is colored? That puts the shoe on the other foot.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman allow me to answer?
Mr. CELLER. I know from my slight

Mr. CELLER. I know from my slight experience—I am not an expert—that when the cattle have to eat the straw and the silage, I think it is called, corn from the silo—maybe I am a little wrong in that, it matters not—the point is that they cannot eat grass, and therefore the butter is not yellow; it is straw-colored, and you add coloring. Now you are being hoist by your own petard and you cannot take it. Therefore, I say you should not put a penalty on oleomargarine, or put any kind of restriction on it so that when it enters interstate commerce it shall be taboo.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will

the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman

from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I wish the gentleman would tell the House why it is that the State of New York only recently, in the last legislature, did not think oleo was so good, and that it absolutely prohibits the sale of colored oleomargarine in the State of New York.

Mr. CELLER. I do not say that New York State is perfect by any means. We make mistakes there, too, especially at the behest of the Dairymen's League. It is inconceivable that we continue to permit an edible commodity to be directly taxed by the Government for the purpose of keeping down its sales, and pushing another product—butter. Remember the license fee and taxes are passed on to the consumer.

It is time to call a halt to this licensing and tax and repeal the sanctions against a wholesome, inexpensive article of diet and thereby support the housewives who are making a valiant effort to meet budgetary needs against the shrinking dollar.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado

[Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first that I am sorry to have to take this stand as a member of one of the greatest committees in this House. probably the most important, even more important than the Committee on Appropriations, because you would not have anything to appropriate if it were not for the agricultural products of this Nation, and that is not a foolish statement. I am sorry to appear today before this House and find no printed hearings. It is not my fault. I corrected all of my remarks right up to the minute, and I say to every Member that whenever the clerks or secretaries sent reports into my office, they are immediately corrected and returned, and here we are today, without a single report of the testimony of a single man or woman that you can sit down and read and learn as you read what these witnesses told our commit-And that is important, ladies and gentlemen, and if I have time this afternoon I would like to analyze the testimony of those witnesses before our committee, wonderful statements, people who have been in the dairy industry all their lives, right from the chairman's own State of North Carolina, where they expect to keep their boys and their girls and the families-all in the dairy business. Yet, we find not a single line of testimony available for the members of this whole Committee to read this afternoon. The only sign I have seen of testimony is in the hands of the opposition.

Now, then, to state the issue just as

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I will certainly yield to my chairman because I am not criticizing him in any sense; he is a great chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Do we have any documents here that the gentleman would like to have?

Mr. HILL. I have them.

Mr. COOLEY. I have documents of two former hearings here, and the gentleman knows full well why those hearings were not printed.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman can take his own time to answer the question. But here is a gentleman sitting over there wanting to read the testimony, and he cannot find them. Do not put them under my nose, because I have read them all. I know what the witnesses said; I know how the witnesses answered the questions. When opposition witnesses

came before the committee, did they speak up forthright and talk the way I am talking? They did not.

Let me state the issue this afternoon. Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. Were there any representatives of the oleomargarine industry before your committee?

Mr. HILL. They were before the committee continuously, on the back row, listening to everything that was said, but they offered nothing to the committee by way of real, constructive thinking. Just think of that, will you?

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will

the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman recalls that when we reported this bill out the halls were filled with oleo people with cameras to take pictures of the people who were going to bring out this bill, but they did not use them. Does the gentleman know that 10 minutes after we reported out this bill the oleo people and the National Association of Manufacturers people were there trying to write the report of this committee?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman from Utah, and I think I am correct—if I am wrong I will withdraw my remarks—that when this committee voted this bill out it voted it out 24 to 3. That does not sound as if we were very much divided.

Let me state the issue. What is the issue this afternoon? The issue is very simply stated. Every man on our side agreed that we should support the overall removal of all taxes, and also any other form of licenses on the statute books concerning oleo. What could be more fair than that? We want the taxes removed, every one of us. I expect to tell all my people I am in favor of removing all the taxes from oleo. Is that what our bill does? It is.

What is the issue, then? The only issue is whether you want oleo sold as butter, and as to that I am going to see that every man stands up and is counted. This is the story. Do you want oleo sold as oleo, or do you want it sold as butter? It is up to this Committee this afternoon to make up its mind. When the final vote comes, that is exactly what you are going to do. That is the issue that is before us now. It is not a question of taxation.

This afternoon you are going to hear those opposed state they are opposed to taxes on oleo. That is not the issue. We are all supporting the removal of the Federal tax. That is the first thing the gentleman who preceded me started to tell you, when he spoke about farming on the streets of New York. I did expect him to say that but I do not expect anyone from Texas to say that, nor from North Carolina.

Let us look for just a moment at the dairy industry. How important is the dairy industry to every man and woman here this afternoon? Let me ask, first of all, how important is it, and I will answer.

ing about.

There is none but expects to leave children and grandchildren to populate our Nation. Strong, virile men and women that are willing to stand up for the principles of democracy we talked about yesterday in the great city of Philadelphia where our leaders wrote the various documents setting out the way of life which is America. It is a great history, revolutionizing the relation of man to his Government. This afternoon you say you are going to support a synthetic food just the same as if it were a natural food, and say to the boys and girls that will follow us, "Maybe you will have bone and muscle and sinew to do the things we have to do to be the leaders of the world." I cannot follow any such philosophy.

There is not a single bit of testimony anywhere that proves to any mother or father that they can feed their children oleo and make professional football or basketball players out of them or strong men and women to leave behind them to carry on the difficult battle of right in this world. That is what we are talk-

If I had the time this afternoon I would analyze just one man's testimony and I could show you by his statements that this might accomplish two most terrible things, the destruction of the fine physical and mental qualities of the boys and girls of this Nation, and finally, wash away the topsoil and impoverish future generations.

I will take any dairy section in the United States-and I do not live in such a section-and compare it with any other section in the United States. The record will show that they are over 100 percent plus, so far as living conditions are concerned and so far as the type of men and women, the boys and girls in those communities.

They are as high as 138 percent. Then you say here this afternoon that you are going to be a party to the destruction, or the beginning of the destruction, of such an industry as the dairy industry. My good chairman, whom I love-and this is no foolish or exaggerated statement-had a friend appear before our committee. The testimony he gave to our committee was bright and happy. He told us how he started out a few years ago by buying 100 gallons of milk a day. Now he buys thousands and thousands of pounds of milk per day from the farmers of North Carolina. That is not all he said.

When we questioned him as to whether the dairymen made money and intended to stay on the farms, whether they intended to keep their boys and girls on the farm, we discovered that North Carolina was one of the finest States in the Union in which to bring up a family. Yet you expect to cast a vote to help destroy the very industry that makes North Carolina great. Why, it is ridiculous.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman about the witnesses who appeared before the committee. Did any of the manufacturers of oleo products appear before the committee and subject themselves to cross-examination?

Mr. HILL. As I recall, they had an attorney. I would like to analyze his testimony if I had the time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to get technical about this now. Did any of the manufacturers appear before the committee? I think the Members will be interested to know.

Mr. HILL. No manufacturer came before the committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Outside of the attorney, what type of witnesses appeared?

Mr. HILL. I will have to admit that most of the witnesses were the dairy people. They were interested in coming before the committee and giving their testimony.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I mean what type of witnesses appeared in support of the bill to permit the interstate movement of colored oleo-who supported that proposition before the committee?

Mr. HILL. I cannot recall anyone who supported it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield. Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Those who appeared before the committee were the attorneys for the Wholesale Food Manufacturers' Association, the attorney for the Retail Merchants' Association. We also had the representative of the League of Women Voters, the Jewish Council, and a few other organizations,

Mr. CRAWFORD. But no manufac-

turers?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, may I have five additional minutes, as I would like to answer these questions.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For some 15 years before being elected to the House, I was a manufacturer. I was continually fighting with my associates on the proposition that the manufacturer himself should appear before these committees.

Mr. HILL. They certainly should.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They should appear before these committees themselves, so as to inform the committees of what is going on in the manufacturing field. I found out then and that situation still exists, all through the manufacturing fraternity, that there is a reluctance to appear before congressional committees, and there is always a design to put up some front. That is not smart business. I want to get that in the record, with regard to this particu-There is no reason why a lar case. manufacturer should not submit himself to cross-examination before these committees. Unless they do that, you do not get the facts on these cases.

Mr. HILL. From the testimony before our committee, we discovered that 65 percent of all the oleo made in this country is made by five companies.

Now, let us get back to the question of how important the dairy industry is to this country. There is not a man or woman on the floor of the House todaybe they Democrat, Republican, New

Dealer, or with Communist leanings, or any other type-who would do one single thing to bring about a depression. But let me say this, that we may be making the very move here this afternoon, which will bring about our next most destructive depression that we could ever have. If you take 2,000,000 dairy cows off the market in the next 6 months, and thus take off the market all the milk which is made into butter, you will bring to agriculture a depression that will make the first depression in agriculture in the twenties look like a celebration. That is not all I have to say.

I will get some more time on this when the bill is being read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. I want to tell you what the dairy industry means to this Nation of ours, which we are placing in jeopardy this afternoon by supporting such legislation that is proposed by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that my good friend from Colorado [Mr. HILL] wants to be fair when he addresses you from the well of this House. He stated a moment ago, in answer to a question by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], that no one interested in margarine as such appeared and testified in support of repeal of the antioleomargarine laws.

I want to read to the Committee a list of the witnesses who appeared in support of such. The following witnesses appeared:

Mr. Harold O. Smith, Jr., executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers Association.

Mr. J. W. Calland, managing director, National Soybean Crop Improvement Council, of Decatur, Ind.

Mr. John W. Evans, vice president, American Soybean Association, Montevideo, Minn.

Mr. C. M. Gregory, manager, Farmers Cooperative Co., Dike, Iowa.

Mr. Lewis G. Hines, representing the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Robert C. Jackson, Washington representative, National Cotton Council of America.

Mrs. Margaret S. Manager, national chairman, American Home Economics Association.

Mr. Robert Lamkin, representing Association of American University Women. Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, legislative chairman, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs.

Nancy Holland, representing Miss Friendship House.

Mrs. Jean Whitehill, Consumers Union of United States.

Mr. Tyre Taylor, representing National Association of Retail Grocers.

Mr. Ralph Wells, a soybean processor. Mr. Donald M. Cresswell, representing

Pennsylvania Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Donald Montgomery, representing

Mr. Clifford Patton, representing the National Association of Consumers.

Several Members of Congress, many others. Furthermore the record was filled with statements, letters, and resolutions in support of our bill and in opposition to the Granger bill.

Incidentally, I hold here a statement issued by the dairy people a few days ago which enumerates some of the witnesses who supported our bill and oppose the Granger bill.

The margarine witnesses were, according to this dairy paper, the Washington lobbyists for the American Federation of Labor; five representatives of professional consumer and women's organizations; one consumers' representative of the CIO United Auto Workers; three representatives of soybean associations and soybean growers; one soybean processor; one Washington representative of a cotton promotion organization; and one representative each from the National Retail and Wholesale Grocers' Association.

So I suggest that when the gentleman leaves the impression that no one appeared in support of outright repeal of all antimargarine laws, he is in absolute

conflict with the record.

Mr. Chairman, the people of my district and the whole South have a great

interest in this fight.

The Fourth District of Mississippi, which I am privileged to represent, consists of 10 hill counties. Most of the 201,000 people within the district live in the rural areas and obtain their living from the farms, a vast majority of which are of the family type. Their major crops and sources of income are cotton, cattle, milk, and grain. The present administration and the Department of Agriculture have geared their policies and programs in the particular interest of this type of farmer. Cotton is by far their major cash crop, and, as I shall point out, cottonseed is all-important to them.

From time to time I have heard statements that the cotton farmer had little direct interest in the margarine fight and that its importance to the Cotton Belt

had been exaggerated.

In my considered judgment, the margarine issue is a vital one to the cotton producers. Anyone familiar with cotton growing knows that cottonseed is particularly important to the person in whom we all profess a great interest—the little man, the poor man, whether share cropper, renter, or owner.

Few cotton producers, even the wealthiest and most affluent ones, finance the crop. They borrow money each year to raise cotton. The larger operators get capital from the bigger banks; the smaller ones from the small banks, from merchants and from the more fortunately

situated producers.

The crop is mortgaged, but in the case of the family-type farmer, the share cropper, and small operators, one portion of the crop generally is left untouched by the mortgage. This portion is the seed. This is a matter of habit and custom, a part of the ritual of producing the South's greatest crop. In bad years this frequently is all the small farmers have left after they have grown the cotton and have paid the expenses of making the lint and seed.

That is why the seed, while approximating only one-fifth the value of the crop, is so important to the little man—the man we say we all wish to help.

The seed then in the case of hundreds of thousands of farmers assumes an importance all out of proportion to its value as compared to the rest of the crop. It has been said, in testimony before the House Agriculture Committee in the past, that the price of seed is a more controversial subject and has more direct influence on the welfare of the attitude of the cotton producers than even the price of cotton.

I am in agreement with that statement. Cottonseed, as many of you know, derives its monetary value from four uses—oil, meal, hulls, and linters. However, in market value the oil is worth more than the other three products of cottonseed combined. On the average, I would say, oil is a little more than 50 percent of the value of cottonseed.

The oil from cottonseed is consumed almost entirely as human food. Generally speaking, more than 90 percent is used to feed people. Cottonseed oil goes into shortening, into margarine, mayonnaise, salad oil, and salad dressing.

The two primary uses of cottonseed oil are in shortening and in margarine. The latter's importance as a market for oil has increased steadily, until now it is ahead even of shortening. For example, of all cottonseed oil used in 1938, shortening consumed about 63.4 percent, margarine only 8.6 percent. In the January to September period, 1948, approximately 35.3 percent of the cottonseed oil used went into margarine, about 21.8 into shortening.

This shift in uses has not been due to any decline in the volume of cottonseed oil used in shortening. The amount of cottonseed oil going into shortening actually has increased but the amount employed in margarine has increased at

a much greater rate.

The 1948 production of margarine is estimated at 900,000,000 pounds. Back in 1940, only 8 years ago, only 320,000,000 pounds of margarine were produced.

I do not need to detail to you the long history of Federal antimargarine legislation. The first act aimed at margarine became law in 1886, a second in 1902, and the third in 1931.

Before the passage of the 1886 law, estimates of the consumption of margarine were as high as 200,000,000 pounds annually. This consumption dropped to 20,000,000 pounds in 1887.

In 1902, when the second Federal antimargarine bill went through, per capita consumption of margarine was estimated at 1.6 pounds per capita. A year or two afterward, consumption had dropped to one-half pound per person.

After enactment of the 1931 act, the consumption of margarine dropped from about 2 pounds per capita to 1.6 in 1932.

Whatever their failure then from a long-time standpoint, the antimargarine laws did succeed for a time in their objective—a reduction in the consumption of margarine.

In so doing, inevitably they reduced the price for cottonseed oil. There is no way of estimating the effect upon the price for this oil. We know, however, that over the years the Federal and State antimargarine laws have taken millions upon millions of dollars from the pockets of the South's cotton producers. Within recent years, as soybean oil began to be used in margarine in large quantities, this legislation likewise reduced the price of soybean oil and hit directly at the pocketbooks of the soybean producers.

Likewise, since the food oils are interchangeable to a large degree, the antimargarine statutes have lowered the price of peanut oil, corn oil, and the

other food oils.

I do not need to point out to you that a comparatively small surplus in fats and oils oftentimes exercises a disproportionate effect upon prices. Also, a small deficit in supply can exercise a disproproportionate effect upon price. I could compare these effects to the oftentimes thin line which lies between solvency and insolvency.

During the war, this country greatly increased its production of domestic fats and oils. We are confronted with the grave problem of finding a market for these oils. Already, prices for domestic fats and oils have dropped sharply. If 453,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil had not gone into margarine in 1948 and also large quantities of soybean oil, prices of domestic fats and oils would be ruinously low.

The producers of all domestic fats and oils, including lard, should insist that there be no restraints upon domestic markets for domestically produced fats and oils. If, for example, the price of cottonseed oil and soybean oil declines the price of almost all other fats and oils fall with them.

I would hesitate to predict the effect of a total ban upon the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine upon the consumption and the prices for cottonseed oil and soybean oil.

Certainly, the butter interests feel that such a ban would reduce the consumption of margarine. That is why they are supporting such legislation and why they have supported other antimargarine laws in the past.

If the color ban is enacted, we can look forward to an intensification of the difficulties in which the producers of cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and peanut oil find themselves.

Much has been said here about the possible affects upon the dairy industry of the repeal of Federal and State antimargarine legislation.

In view of the fact that butter is the least profitable use of milk and that the country stands greatly in need of expanded uses for whole milk, cheese, and ice cream, I think the statements about danger to the dairy industry are unwarranted.

But if we are to discuss seriously possible damage to the dairy industry, what about damage to the cottonseed industry, the soybean industry, and the peanut industry from the ban on yellow margarine?

Butter's pleas, if they are examined impartially, are simply pleas not to be forced to compete fairly and squarely with the products from the other American farms.

The drop in dairy prices is pointed out and stress put upon the decline. What about the drop in the prices of cottonseed, of soybeans, and of the other products which produce the fats and oils that go into margarine? Aren't the farmers who raise cotton, the lowest income group in the United States, to be considered? Has not the time come to remove the burden placed upon them by unfair laws? Do they not deserve consideration? Are we to remove the taxes on margarine but to ban yellow margarine entirely?

What does the proposal to remove these taxes but to ban yellow margarine mean? It means removing the taxes, so far as yellow margarine is concerned, on a product that is outlawed. In other words, the butter interests say, remove the taxes on yellow margarine but ban it completely. Anyone can see that a ban on yellow margarine is much worse than the 10-cents-a-pound tax which now exists. The proposal from the butter lobby is not a compromise. It is an attempt to damage margarine more than other punitive laws have damaged it in the past.

Butter and oleomargarine are competitors. Both are products of the farm. I believe that every Member of this House wants to be fair. I cannot believe that any of us accepted our seats in Congress for the purpose of securing or maintaining an advantage of one farm product over another farm product. We are charged with the duty of treating them with equal fairness. To favor one industry by restricting another is not, in my opinion, compatible with democracy nor is it in the best interest of all business as a whole, or of the American people. It is just as contrary to the American system of free enterprise to legislate for American-produced butterfat as against American-produced cottonseed and soybean oil, the basic element of oleomargarine, as it would be to legislate for American-produced cotton fiber against American-produced synthetic rayon fiber. Rayon is a competitor of cotton. It has come on the market in a system of free enterprise. It is a serious threat to the thousands of farmers who grow cotton. Yet no Member of Congress from the Cotton Belt has to my knowledge urged or offered punitive legislative measures against the rayon industry. That, however, is exactly what the Congress tolerates in the case of butter as against oleomargarine.

As a Representative of a district which has a flourishing cotton industry and a flourishing dairy industry, I want to be fair to both. If I am to be fair, if I am to do my duty as I see it, I cannot consent to the continuation of an injustice inflicted upon those least able to bear it—the cotton farmers of the South and the Cotton Belt of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Abernethy] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that my genial friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Abernethy] was not listening when I was speaking, because I made no such statement. I said no manufacturers of oleomargarine appeared before our committee. That is exactly what I said, as the Record will show. Of course I call your attention to how many cotton people appeared and

all of those who were paid by the oleomargarine people to come and make their testimony.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My whole point was based on manufacturers of oleomargarine, and not these other miscellaneous witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Christopher].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman,

it is absolutely impossible to handle a subject like this in 5 minutes. If I had 20 minutes' time I would nail this thing so tight to the floor you could not pry it up with a crowbar, but I have not got time. I want everybody in this House who believes that the poor woman shopper of the United States ought to be allowed to buy a cheap spread for her bread to vote for the Granger bill, and here is why: As long as there is white oleo for sale in the United States she can buy it cheaper than butter: as soon as the oleo people get the chance to make oleo yellow and sell it without any restriction all over the United States, it will cost more than butter and it will rob that poor woman who is pinched by her budget of the opportunity to go and buy a cheap spread to put on the bread for her children. I can prove it, and I will tell you how you can prove it. Go to the grocery store around the corner and price 3 pounds of vegetable oil, and you will find it will cost \$1. Price 3 pounds of hog lard, the best shortening and frying fat the world has ever produced, and you can buy it for 50 cents. How did the vegetable-oil manufacturers

bring that about? By advertising that

if you eat vegetable oils and do not eat

lard you can retain that boyish and

girlish figure. They forgot the fact that

the vegetable oil fattens the hogs that

make the lard. Is that ridiculous, or is

it not?

They say this is an economic question; it is no such thing. It is not an economic question; it is a soil-conserving question and nothing else in the world. I stand before you this evening proposing that you make a spread for the Nation's bread out of bluegrass and timothy, lespedeza and sweet clover, alfalfa, and red clover and white clover; that is the kind of farm products I want to make butter out of. What are they? They are the soil-conserving crops of this Nation. I can sell a thousand dollars worth of butter off my dairy farm and have just as good a farm as I had before I sold the butter; but you sell a thousand dollars worth of soybeans, of cottonseed, of peanuts, off your farm, and you have sold a definite part of your farm. There is no way that you can avoid it. Ride over your farming country and look at the soybean land, see how it has washed away. I have stated in this House before, and I know it to be a fact-I yield to no man in this House or anywhere else when it comes to soil conservation and what will build up soil and what will destroy it; I have watched it and worked with it for 50 years, and I

know all there is to know about it. I know it first-hand; I did not learn it on the streets of New York. New York is a great city, but how long would it last without soil? In one week, denied the products of the soil New York City would be in dire distress; in 1 year it would be a ghost town in ruin; that is what would become of New York. When you chase the dairy farmer out of business as the oleo manufacturer intends to chase him out of business by counterfeiting his product and ruining his market-and the gentleman who favors the Poage bill stood here today and would not say a word about filled milk-if you take the step of legalizing yellow margarine all over the United States this year, then next year they will bring in the filled milk bill, and if they get by with that then the next year they will bring in the synthetic ice-cream bill; and pretty soon, as one gentleman said here today, when you want any milk product you will simply take a pill.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, New York City would be all right if it had a few silos, would it not?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That would help, sir.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Is it not a fact that practically every agricultural publication in the country says that the only hope for a prosperous agriculture in the South is an agriculture based on animal husbandry?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That is right. The South needs a dairy industry as bad as any part of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. There was not an expert on agriculture who appeared before our committee but what stated the same thing the gentleman just mentioned; that is, without a good prosperous dairy industry, you cannot maintain the fertility of the soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic platform has been spoken of here today as coming out for repeal of the oleo tax. The Granger bill repeals the oleo tax, but fixes it so it cannot masquerade in every hotel, in every restaurant, in every eating house, in every institution, and in every home of the land as butter.

One gentleman here spoke about butter being colored, and he talked about the straw that the cows eat in the winter time. A cow does not give milk from straw, neither does she produce butter from straw. We feed a cow nice green legume hay, a good silage, and some cottonseed meal that we buy from down South. That is what we feed our cows to give milk. Our butter does not need coloring if the cow is properly fed. Of course, she will give enough milk to make cream for your coffee if you run her in a stalk field and milk her over in the

corner of some rail fence, but we do not do that. I can understand how a gentleman from New York would imagine all you had to do to get milk was to catch a cow and milk her. But today the dairy business requires more than that. It is a specialized industry. If you want to destroy it, you can do so with this unfair competition, but when you do, do not say, "We did it because we felt sorry for the poor woman who has to buy cheap oleo," because the things they are proposing to do will rob her of the only opportunity she ever had to buy a cheap spread for her bread.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I had requested the gentleman from Missouri to yield so that I might say to the House that I thought the gentleman from Missouri has brought out the one point that is most pertinent to this question, and that is, "Are you interested or are you not interested in preserving the soil of this Nation?" If you are interested, vote down the Poage bill when it comes before the House.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentle-

Mr. Chairman, the question here today is whether we should permit the transportation of colored oleomargarine. As far as I am concerned, I realize that the reason that cleomargarine is colored is in imitation of butter. I can well recall last December when my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Murray] was debating with Dr. Carlson, who was the spokesman of the oleomargarine interests, on the question of butter versus oleomargarine. Dr. Carlson is a very capable gentleman. He is and was at that time representing and speaking for the oleomargarine interests. Dr. Carlson under questioning by the gentleman from Wisconsin, said that the principal reason for the desire to color oleomargarine yellow was to break down a natural sales resistance. The coloring of oleomargarine yellow makes it an imitation of a natural product. The color of butter is yellow; it is a natural color. There are times during the year when the cows are off pasture in the barn that they are fed from silos and the result is that at that time it is necessary, to maintain a uniform yellow color, to slightly color the butter. But, it should not be construed in any way as being an imitation of any other product. It is put in to maintain the regular yellow color of butter, which is naturally yellow.

Now, dairy farming is peculiar. You cannot go into the dairy business quickly and you cannot get out of it quickly. Why, it is necessary to spend 15 to 20 years in building up dairy herds. They cannot be built up in a hurry. Then they must be culled and reculled in order to cut out the low producers to make it profitable. In addition to that, the dairy

farmer must maintain large and expensive barns. He must construct large silos in order to store food for the cattle during the winter months. In addition to that he is required to meet very rigid sanitary regulations, both State and Federal. He must keep the entrance of the building that he cools his milk in a prescribed distance from the barn. He must meet these rigid requirements that cost thousands and thousands of dollars on every farm unit. Then, in addition to that he must buy expensive and diversified machinery so as to cultivate and to harvest his many products economically; the dairy farmer has a larger investment in proportion to his gross income than any other industry in the world.

I understand that many leading dairy and farm organizations are agreed on the suggestion that oleo taxes and license fees be repealed. This is being misinterpreted to mean the repeal of all restrictions on the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine. This movement which threatens the very existence of the dairy industry is sponsored and financed by the oleomargarine manufacturers, a small industrial group that seeks to remove all restrictions on the sale of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter.

The fight between oleo and butter is an economic battle. On the one hand you have 2,500,000 dairy-farm families, 40,000 small dairy plants and their employees as against 28 large oleomargarine manufacturers. The dairy farmers are a vital part of our national economy, they pay substantial taxes and also provide the Nation with vital and nutritious food. They merely want the synthetic product called oleomargarine to be sold for what it is and not to permit it to be disguised as an imitation of butter by coloring it yellow.

I believe it is very conservative to say that the relationship between the producers of cotton and the cleo and crushers of cottonseed has not been conducive to a sound economy. The cottonseed-oil industry sets the market price—they make the money, not the cotton farmer.

The dairyman is in an economy in which butter is the balance wheel; more than 25 percent of all milk produced goes into butter.

From year to year the dairyman, by reason of rigid State requirements and voluntary usages relative to sanitary requirements, has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in more modernized farm equipment; built new or remodeled old barns and silos, bought milking machines, and so forth, fertilized the soil so as to produce more and better feed. In most areas, he has carried on soil-conservation work, has prevented, in part, soil erosion. All of this has been done because he anticipated that this greatest of all agricultural industries, namely dairying, and. I might say at this point that most of this work was done under the guidance of the State and Federal Government—at least with their approval. Farm boys have attended the universities in ever-increasing numbers, so that they in turn can take over, and in an intelligent way carry on the work so well done by their parents. They

have the intellectual and technical ability to carry on in this worthy endeavor. They are literally the backbone of the Nation. Shall their future be jeopardized by the Congress permitting this synthetic product to be sold in imitation of their natural and wholesome product?

The family-sized farm is doomed if this economic blow is dealt to the dairy

industry.

Competent economists have shown. and it has not been questioned, that to sell vellow oleo unrestricted would take away an additional 600,000,000 pounds a year in butter sales. The cost of this loss in sales to the dairy farmers would be a quarter of a million dollars in cash income. The long-term result would be liquidation of dairy herds on a large scale. The small farm unit would not be able to operate any longer. This terrible economic readjustment is threatened because the oleo interests of the Nation, who are making handsome profits now, want to expand their business by being permitted to color their product yellow in imitation of butter, whose natural color is yellow. Their object is to fool the consumer and break down a natural sales resistance.

The dairy farmers welcome the expansion of dairying in the cotton areas, and it is of vital interest to you from Cotton States that the status of butter be preserved. The cotton producer realizes, I believe, that the farmers of the Nation are their best customers by buying edible vegetable oils in shortenings for salad and desserts, and for spreads; likewise cottonseed meal is used for feed; which is bringing at the present time between \$85 and \$100 a ton; and also cotton

products.

It must also be borne in mind that any break in the economy of the dairy farmer would severely impair the soil-conservation program which is making wonderful strides in the voluntary conservation of our soil. A break in that economy would also affect adversely our rural-electrification program which, with its further expansion, will accomplish more to raise the standards of living of those in the rural areas than any one other factor. A blow to the dairy economy would also endanger our farm-credit program which is doing much to help our farm economy. In fact, a blow to our dairy economy would have severe repercussions to the entire agriculture set-up.

This is a most inopportune time to be considering this type of legislation, with dairy prices on a sharp decline, and legislation in the hopper for further farmprice supports. With all somewhat in accord that we must cooperate in an effort to help one another, in come the oleo interests to completely—if they are successful—upset the best of our plans with a scheme which is as destructive as it

is deceptive.

Oleo manufacturers are guilty of trying to mislead the public to believe that their product is naturally yellow, and that they are compelled by Federal restrictions to remove this yellow color by bleaching or pay the 10-cent tax per pound. They also say that butter is colored with the same dyes with which oleo is colored and to restrain their use of yellow color is unjustified discrimination.

The natural color of oleo is white or gray, and, I understand, must be bleached in most instances to make it white. The natural color of butter is yellow, except during the winter months when the cows are off pasture. Then a coloring is used to make the color uniform the year around. But it is not put in to deceive the consumer.

I am reliably informed for the year 1947 that the oleo manufacturers spent \$6,600,000 for advertising directed, in part, toward the repeal of oleo restrictions. In 1948 they spent an additional \$5,400,000 to mislead the American housewife on the question of yellow oleomargarine.

Perhaps there are people whose incomes are so low that it may be necessary for them to eat oleomargarine instead of butter, but it is not fair for them to be deceived by the yellow color into thinking they are buying and eating butter.

Fraudulent substitution of yellow eleomargarine for butter must be prevented. This can be accomplished by a flat ban being placed on the imitation of butter through the commercial manufacture or sale of yellow eleomargarine.

Under such a prohibition, the housewives could obtain all the oleo they wanted to buy uncolored and tax-free. At the same time, the ban on imitation butter would curb unfair competition for the butter market.

My people are alarmed; they know what happened to agriculture from 1920 to 1929. They are fearful that this latest unwarranted attack may have the same disastrous result—not merely the collapse of the great dairy industry but likewise the disintegration of our entire economic structure, for agriculture is our basic industry.

Might I remind the Members of the House that every major depression we have had has been preceded by declining agricultural prices and values.

If the taxes are repealed, then there should be an effective prohibition of the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Chesney].

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Chairman, the case of butter against oleomargarine again takes the spotlight before this august body. In the Eightieth Congress the probutter forces suffered a set-back, but as we have witnessed in the days and months preceding this legislative day, the butter groups have been capably working.

As a result, we have before us today a bill providing for the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine. Now this is somewhat a reversal of attitude since the battle began. But in conceding to this repeal of the Federal taxes and the Federal ban on the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine, there has been inserted in the bill a clause which is most undesirable in solving this pressing problem. This clause would prohibit the transportation of yellow margarine across State lines. In this regard, the bill is violating a concept of our country's economic system. This is the bill

which our good friends of the butter lobby want this Congress to pass.

Those members of the Agriculture Committee who voted to bring out this emasculated repeal bill certainly cannot be blamed because, no doubt, their constituency is composed of dairy farmers and dairy industries who have fought this bill for many years, and who have charged those members of the committee with the responsibility of representing their interests in Congress. However, the distinguished members of the Agriculture Committee knew that the temperament of the Nation was demanding the abolishment of these discriminatory taxes and restrictions on an important domestic food product. Therefore, a compromise stand was taken by the Agriculture Committee in reporting out the Granger bill.

I am opposed to this bill in its present form. As a Congressman from a city district, it is my duty to vote for a bill which will provide the housewives of this Nation an opportunity to purchase and use eleomargarine of their own choice.

use oleomargarine of their own choice. This is not only my position, but the position of housewives throughout the Nation who find it necessary for reasons of economy to use, when possible, oleomargarine as a substitute for butter.

The women of Chicago have protested and our local newspapers have taken up the issue and have presented both sides of the question. The newspapers of the city of Chicago have as great a circulation in the rural areas as they do in the metropolitan center.

The Illinois State Register, a newspaper which is published in Springfield, the capital of the great State of Illinois, which is located in the very heart of our farming section, printed, on March 19, 1949, an article by the editor, V. J. Dallman, which read as follows:

UNDEMOCRATIC BUTTER LOBBY

The probutter, antioleomargarine pressure group is one of the most unorthodox special interests that has ever lobbied its will on Congress.

To our knowledge, it is the only group that ever succeeded in securing legislation discriminating against one food product to the advantage of another. Margarine, admittedly a perfectly good food, has been singled out for punitive legislation as has no other domestic food product.

In a competitive economy based upon free enterprise, there is no more reason why butter makers should complain that oleo manufacturers are hurting their business, than for the oleo industry to charge the dairymen with injurying the margarine trade.

The butter lobby operates under the front of helping the consumers, and trys in every way possible to deny the consumers a free choice. In the present Congress the butter men are attempting to throttle oleo manufacturers by passing the Granger bill, which would ban the interstate shipment and sale of yellow margarine.

In pressing for adoption of this bill, the dairy interests have dropped both their insistence on Federal taxes and a Federal ban on the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine, Instead, they have inserted a bigger gimmick. Although the Granger bill would repeal the Federal taxes on margarine, no yellow margarine could be shipped across State lines. This violates a cardinal principle upon which this country's economic system has been built—the free flow of domestic commerce across State lines.

The bill would support a principle which denies consumers the benefits of mass production that have increased efficiency and lessened costs in industry after industry, including the margarine industry.

cluding the margarine industry.

What would happen, for example, if, by Federal law, automobiles could be sold only in the State in which they were manufactured? In prohibiting the interstate shipment and sale of margarine, the bill is returning to a concept which almost wrecked this country in the early days of the Articles of Confederation, when each State freely levied duties and other restrictions upon the products of other States. The whole thing is slightly preposterous.

Butter has no God-given rights that demand Federal protection. There is no more reason why butter be protected against oleo than that olive oil be protected against vegetable oils; or real rubber tires against tires of synthetic rubber; or slik dress goods against rayon, or both silk and rayon against the newcomer, nylon. The consumers go to the grocery store and buy pure lemon juice or artificial lemon extract, as they choose. They buy fresh or condensed milk; coffee or Postum; soap or detergent; egg noodles or macaroni; cakes fresh from the bakery, or a box of cake mix with which to bake their own. They know what they are getting and are free to choose. Why, in the name of common sense, should they not be allowed to choose freely between colored margarine and butter, without the benefit of any Government regu-

Apparently, the only logical answer is, because the butter interests are afraid that if given a free choice, a great many of the customers would buy oleo.

And, if the people want to buy oleo without restrictions, Congress, which is elected to represent them, should certainly give the people the chance.

Now, why should the butter interests be opposed to the freedom of oleomargarine? Are they fearful that the sale of butter will drop? I firmly believe that those people who use butter will continue to use butter as they always have. Just the other day Government figures showed that Americans are eating more butter than oleomargarine. It is another indication of the fact that low prices on butter will encourage sales, and ultimately bring greater profits. The dairy farmer has not suffered and will not suffer because of competition with oleomargarine.

Let us forget about sanctions which affect our tables, and pass legislation which will conform with the objectives of our democratic concepts of living.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. White].

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I noted with considerable interest the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri and the amusing manner in which he put forth his speech. I was particularly impressed with the remarks he made about the conservation of our soil. I know that that idea has been kicked around, so to speak, by the dairy interests for some time-that is, that unless we continue to discriminate against yellow oleomargarine we cannot maintain the fertility of our soil. As the gentleman said, the city of New York would go back to the Indians, or something to that effect.

I am a farmer myself and I keep my soil in condition by growing cover crops and turning them under. The matter of maintaining the soil fertility of this Nation is not at all tied up with the dairy industry. It is true that it helps, but it certainly is not the only alternative.

To bring another point into this matter we have had in discussion here the question of who is in favor of maintaining this discrimination against yellow oleo and who is not. I have had many letters on the subject. The one that struck me the most is this little handwritten letter I received from Modesto, Calif. It is very brief and I will read it to you. It says:

DEAR MR. WHITE: I am damned tired of mixing color into oleo. Please be governed accordingly.

Yours very truly.

Let me say to you that there are many housewives in this country who reflect that sentiment.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the subcommittee which held the hearings on this bill. I want to say to you that we heard many hours of useless testimony-testimony that dealt with the relative merits of butter and oleomargarine. Testimony that dealt with whether the butter dealers or the oleo manufacturers are the big bad baronstestimony that dealt with whether or not an unrestricted market on oleomargarine would adversely affect the dairy industry. And let me say that all such testimony is really incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial, as the lawyers say in court cases. To my way of thinking, the only thing that really counts in this matter is this: "Is the housewife entitled to buy what she wants or is she not?'

If she wants to buy imitation pearls, she can buy them under the law. wants to buy an imitation fur coat, she can buy it under the law-and if she wants to buy vegetable shortening, in white color just like real hog lard, she

can buy that under the law.

But if her husband happens to be one of the millions of Americans whose income is so low that she cannot afford to buy butter, the proposed Granger bill would prevent her from buying the cheap but healthy and nutritious oleomargarine in the color she desires, unless she happens to live in a State which contains a manufacturing plant which produces vellow-colored oleomargarine. plants do not exist in 33 of the 48 States in this Nation. But even if they did exist in every State, it is not just or equitable to place a color prohibition against one product in favor of another product.

Much has been said about oleomargarine being sold as butter through deception. Let me assure you, my fellow Members, that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], the author of H. R. 3, has leaned over backward to provide positive assurance that every ounce of oleo shall be sold only as oleo. He has provided in his bill that the public shall have due notice of individual servings of oleo in public eating places. There is no chance for deception under the Poage bill. I have heard about this controversy between butter and oleo for many years, but I confess that I had knowingly tasted oleo in my life, until last week. I purposely went to the store and bought a package of oleo just to satisfy the curiosity which listening to the hearings on this matter has engendered, and let me say to my friends on the butter side of this controversy, that after comparing the taste of oleomargarine and butter, I cannot understand what the butter people are worrying about. I say to you, that since there are millions of unfortunate American families with low incomes, who are not able to afford anything but this mediocre tasting substitute, for heaven's sake let them have it in any color that will make it reasonably palatable.

The most striking testimony we had in the hearings on this bill was from a lady representing the housewives of America. She let us know in unmistakable terms that the housewives of America want this color restriction on oleo removed. And let us not forget, my fellow Members, that women do about half the vot-

ing in this country of ours.

So again I urge you, ladies and gentlemen, to vote against the Granger bill and for the passage of the Poage bill and give fair treatment to the consumers of the

To my friends representing dairy intcrests, I wish to say that I have no desire to hurt the dairy people and to prove this I want to point out that I have introduced a bill to support the price of dairy products at 90 percent of parity. Also, I want to say in closing that I do not believe the removal of color restrictions on oleo will hurt the dairy industry.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, this is supposed to be the administration of the little fellows. At least, during the campaign last year our Democratic friends tried to make some headway by asserting that they were the party of the little people and that the rest of us were the barons of personal privilege. I am quite sure that the people of the country are rather disillusioned by now about the whole situation. Almost the first thing the Eighty-first Congress heard upon reconvening last January was a plea by the administration for higher taxes and it was frankly stated by the President that. in his judgment, everybody earning over \$6,000 a year should be taxed some more. Almost immediately thereafter the Congress almost doubled the President's salary and expense account, part of which was tax exempt. I am sure the little fellows of the country are beginning to catch on.

Now bringing the picture up to date, approximately 3 months after the convening of the Eighty-first Congress we find the issue clearly drawn today in the fight between 28 oleomargarine manufacturers, the monopoly boys, against 2,500,000 dairy farmers, most of whom are really the little fellows in the dairy industry today. The country should know that once more the administration is lined up with the oleomargarine interests and seems to be very little concerned about the possibility of our dairy herds being liquidated and some 10,000,-000 Americans who are dependent upon the dairy industry for a living being put out of business. The majority leadership in the House of Representatives, speaking and acting for the administration, seems to be determined to do everything it can to assist the eleo monopoly. well knowing that in so doing it may virtually destroy one great segment of our agricultural economy-the dairy industry.

Everyone should know that agriculture is the Nation's basic industry. The dairy industry is a vital part of our agricultural economy. The economy of a country like this is in some respects comparable to a complex living organism. All of the parts are closely interrelated. If one part fails to function, or functions improperly, the entire organism is endangered. We have all learned through bitter experience that when one important segment of our economy suffers, the entire economy is upset. Dairy farmers are not merely the persons who supply milk and dairy products to people in cities and towns. They also form one of the largest groups of customers for products of our cities and towns, and the farmer's wife is well aware of the implications of a smaller milk check. Dairy farmers sold about \$4,000,-000,000 worth of milk and milk products in 1947. A great portion of this money was expended for goods produced in cities-shoes, clothing, cars, and all the numerous items that families require. Reductions in the incomes of dairy farmers would inevitably be reflected in reduced purchases of such manufactured products.

As previously stated, 10,000,000 Americans are dependent upon the dairy industry for a livelihood. They include 2,500,-000 dairy industry farmers and their families, 250,000 dairy industry workers, the staffs and employees of 40,000 local dairy plants, and the employees of 3.500 creameries located in every State in the Union. These are the little fellows, most of them whose income will be reduced if the Poage bill is substituted for the Granger-Andresen bill or if the restrictions on the coloring of oleo in imitation of butter are removed. By backing the Poage bill or the Rivers bill or removing the color restriction, a mere 28 oleomargarine manufacturers seek a monopoly of the spread market at the expense of the dairy farmer. Five of these 28 manufacturers are giant corporations which already control 65 percent of the 906,000,-000 pounds of oleomargarine produced

annually in this country.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that not a single representative of the oleomargarine-manufacturing industry appeared before our committee when this legislation was considered. Interesting to note also is the fact that the oleomargarine side did not present a single farmer. The oleomargarine witnesses mainly consisted of Washington lobbyists and representatives of consumer groups. I do not think that even my cottonseed-oil friends from the South should be deluded by what the oleomargarine manufacturers expect to do if the Poage substitute or the Rivers substitute is adopted. These bills will not add a single penny now paid to the cottonseed farmers for their oil since those prices must compete with other vegetable oils in the world's market. Do they not know that Procter & Gamble and Lever Bros., two gigantic processors of oils for the Nation's 28 oleo manufacturers, have access to overseas plantations producing coconut, palm, and many other oils with the help of low-cost native labor? There certainly is no assurance that American oleomargarine will continue to be made from domestic oils, and I venture the prediction that when and if the oleomargarine manufacturers leave the cottonseed-oil boys flat, they will be the first ones to ask this Congress to protect their interests.

I am very much concerned about the present decline in our cow population. It has declined 2.731,000 head since 1945, only a period of 4 years. The decline is more serious in the butter-producing States. During this 4-year period, there has been a percentage decline in cow population of 28.4 percent in North Dakota, 25.3 percent in South Dakota, 16.9 percent in Iowa, 24.7 percent in Nebraska, 22.9 percent in Kansas, and 14.3 percent in Minnesota. If the Poage substitute is adopted or the color restriction removed, it is my considered judgment that the cow population will be further reduced, thus affecting the economy of the entire country. We all know what has happened to the sheep population during the past few years, and a similar liquidation of our dairy herds will very likely occur when the butter market is lost to the dairy farmers of America. If the unrestricted sale of yellow oleo is permitted, yellow oleo will replace butter to a volume of as much as 600,000,000 pounds annually. This increase in yellow-oleo sales will result in a decrease in the price of butter from 25 percent to 40 percent. Contraction in butter sales will cost the American dairy farmers \$638,000,000 a year. Serious dislocations in the markets and prices of other dairy products, including fluid milk, will affect 40,000 milk-processing plants and 2,500,000 dairy-farm families in every State of the Union. The natural result will be the slaughter of an estimated 2,000,000 head of dairy cattle, which certainly will disrupt livestock and meat prices and marketing. Dissipation of our soil resources will result from discouraging dairy farming-the most important contributor to sound soil conservation the country has ever known. This may all bring about a consequent depression in a critically important branch of farming which will affect retail sales and the economic life in cities, towns, and hamlets in every section of America.

Proponents of the Poage substitute and the Rivers bill should be looking further ahead than the tips of their noses. If oleomargarine manufacturers are given the unrestricted right to color their product yellow in semblance of butter, it stands to reason that practically all of the white oleomargarine now manufactured will be colored yellow to imitate butter. Hence, the cheaper, uncolored form now available at a reasonable price to consumers will tend to disappear entirely from the market. Do not let anybody be deceived. Whenever most of the oleo is colored yellow in imi-

tation of butter, its price will increase by at least 10 cents a pound and, as a consequence, people in the lower-income groups will not only be deprived of the white oleomargarine spread they can now purchase at a reasonable price, but will find that such white oleomargarine will no longer be available.

I would like to discuss the real necessity of retaining and maintaining the fertility of our farms by dairy and livestock farming. Time, however, does not permit; but suffice it to say that the more imitation butter produced, the less fertile the soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Iowa two additional minutes

Mr. HOEVEN. I am sure the following table of 1948 comparative monthly farm-wage rates between certain dairy States and nondairy States will prove of interest. This table shows that the wage rates, without board, in the dairy States far exceeds those in some of the Southern States, where there is very little dairy industry. The table conclusively shows that where dairying flourishes we have better soil conservation and a higher standard of living.

The monthly farm-wage rates (1948) without board

South Carolina	\$58
Mississippi	62
Alabama	63
Georgia	63
North Carolina	84
Pennsylvania 1	121
Illinois 1	130
Minnesota1	140
New York	142
Iowa	143
Wisconsin	147

In closing, I would like to give you a few figures on the State of Iowa. For several years the State has ranked second in the Nation in the production of butter. Cows are milked on 9 out of every 10 farms. Most of these are family-sized dairy farms and a very large percentage of the milk on these farms is farm separated. Practically all the farm-separated cream is churned into creamery butter. We have some 400 creameries producing butter in the State, most of them local cooperatives, made up of the little fellows on the farms. These local creameries are the backbone of our little towns and cities. The regular checks which they pay to their hundreds of thousands of farmer patrons have meant a steady income and a stable business in all of these 400 communities. The merchants and professional men in these towns well remember the days in the early thirties when the dairy farmer's checks were mighty small. Some of them are feeling the pinch today of lower milk and cream checks. They would feel the pinch severely if and when the dairy plants close, and the pinch would soon enough be reflected in the bigger cities. Dairy products are the third largest source of farm income in Iowa. In 1947 figures show cash receipts for dairy products of \$177,000,000. Farmers have sizable investments in cattle, buildings, and equipment. Cost of milk-production studies show that dairymen generally

have as much invested in buildings and equipment as in their herds. Iowa farmers on this basis have a total dairy investment of over \$457,000,000.

Over 70 percent of Iowa's milk is sold for butter. What metropolitan markets can take the fluid milk produced by Iowa or our dairy State cows if butter markets are changed over to oleo? The milk from tens of thousands of farms that now goes into butter cannot crowd into the fluid markets, and remember this-if there is no butter or fluid-milk markets, farmers will simply have to sell their herds. Creameries will have to close. Bankers, barbers, merchants, and mechanics will suffer. Yes, the farmers can grow other crops but what will happen to the economy of this country if fluid milk disappears and the butter market is gone?

Members of Congress who are really interested in the welfare of this country should think twice before voting for any legislation which will drive the dairy industry to the wall. This should not be a sectional issue. It is a question of what is right and just. Under the provisions of the Granger-Andresen bill, all Federal taxes are removed. That seems to be the thing the consumers of the country were most concerned about. A recent survey shows that approximately 62 percent of the consumers do not care whether oleomargarine is colored yellow or not. If this is true, why the determined effort of 28 oleomargarine manufacturers to steal the traditional yellow color of butter so that they can fool the people, drive butter from the market, and eventually destroy the dairy industry in this country.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, in the last session of Congress I voted to retain the Federal tax of 10 cents per pound on colored oleomargarine. To have voted otherwise, that is to remove the tax, would have been of no benefit to the people of Michigan. My State, like many other States, had a law which prohibited both the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine.

That law, which had been on the books in Michigan since 1892, has been repealed by the present Legislature of Michigan, now in session.

The tax on oleomargarine was an issue in my district during the last campaign. I told the people that, if Michigan changed or repealed the law, permitting the sale or manufacture of colored oleomargarine, I would vote to repeal the Federal tax. That promise shall be kept. I shall vote for H. R. 2023, which repeals such taxes on oleomargarine.

In the bill, however, is a provision in section 2 which I fear will defeat the very purpose of the bill. That section provides that the manufacture, transportation, sale, use, or possession of colored oleo in interstate commerce is declared unlawful. It means that only colored oleomargarine manufactured within a State could be sold or used. Suppose that one ingredient used in the making of oleo was shipped across State lines. The question of interstate commerce could arise or the shipment in commerce could be interposed, which is declared unlawful under this bill.

The average American housewife wants the privilege of buying oleo without mixing or coloring it at home. The bill before us, as presently drawn, may defeat that very objective.

I hope the committee in charge of this legislation will clarify and correct this

provision of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. Chatham].

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, in speaking in support of the Granger bill, I am very sorry it is not stronger. I wish I could speak in support of a bill that would completely outlaw the sale of any substitute for butter colored yellow. I have had no butter lobby after me.

For 30 years I have been trying to help the dairy industry in the South. I am one who believes that our whole future in the South depends on an increase in our livestock population and in a new generation of farmers who will know how to handle livestock and in a South whose agricultural economy will be based on livestock, pastures, legumes, and then for our cash crops—wheat, tobacco, cotton, and peanuts. We have learned in We have learned in the South during the past 25 years that we can have 12 months' grazing. have learned that we can grow good pastures in the South by the use of limes and phosphates. We can grow alfalfa We have learned to put borax on it. And we are building a great dairy industry. Our dairy products in North Carolina from less than a million dollars 20 years ago rose to more than \$34,000,-000 in 1946.

Mr. Chairman, most of all I want to speak on what I think it would have to do with the health and the future of our southern children. If you will compare the children from a dairy country with the children from a country like parts of my district, where their only cash crops are tobacco and cotton, you will immediately be struck by the difference. We all know that children require milk. Butter is a product of milk. Whole milk has the butter in it. In spite of the fact that margarine may be a wholesome article and that it may be revitaminized by running it under a blue light and irradiating it, I do not believe this proposed bill will make children what they are in the great dairy countries.

I spent some time during the war along the coast of New Guinea and I saw a great deal of copra being dried. I believe that copra goes into Nucoa, one of the well-known substitutes for butter. If you could see the conditions under which copra is dried and handled, if you could see the people of New Guinea and would see the disease and the size of them and the intelligence, and know they live off of coconuts mainly, from which copra is made and from which coconut oil goes into a great many of the substitutes; then if you were to look at the children of the Scandinavian countries, Norway and Sweden, or Holland, and see the children from the dairy country, and see the children in our own Northwest, then go down again into certain tropical countries like Africa you would see the difference. I have been told by eminent scientists that in spite of the fact they

have a great deal of disease in Africa and bad health and do not live long, there is one tribe in the center of Africa, the Massi, who keep and grow cattle and who are raised on milk and cheese. I think the future of our South is tied up in this bill in that every pound of butter substitute will be detrimental to the future of the dairy industry.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gen-

tleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman think that the sale of margarine will help the butter business? The history of the world is that those nations which consume the most margarine also consume the most butter. The history of the United States is that those States which have restrictions against the sale of yellow margarine get a less price for butter and for their milk and cheese than the States that have not those restrictions. Why does the gentleman assume that it will displace butter?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman let me answer that?

Mr. CHATHAM. I think I can handle that myself—because wherever I have seen oleomargarine used, it was used in place of butter. To me that is a very simple answer and a proper one. If my wife buys a pound of oleomargarine she lays off of a pound of butter.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman's wife can afford to buy butter, but the woman who cannot afford to buy butter would buy oleomargarine if she is given the opportunity.

Mr. CHATHAM. I do not take too much stock in that.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The reason that man can afford to buy butter and that woman can afford to buy butter is because this Nation is known as a dairy Nation, just like the countries that the gentleman has just talked about. If in time you destroy the dairy industry, you will not be able to buy even oleomargarine that some folks would like to have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Chairman, as a Representative of the great State of New York on the House Committee on Agriculture, I wish to say that I am a little irked this afternoon hearing so many references of a facetious nature regarding my home State. the edification and information of those who have been wont to refer to New York as a metropolis of houses packed closely together, of factories, of smokestacks, and so forth, let me say that New York State, second only to Wisconsin, is the greatest dairy-producing State in the country. If the members of the 43 granges in my district could hear these facetious remarks directed at the most genuine farmers in America. I hesitate to imagine what they would do. For the record, I want you to know I am a Granger in good standing and have been for many years.

I voted against this bill last year, and I was one of the very few Members from a dairy district who did vote against it. The only issue in my vote against the bill last year was the fact that the tax on oleo was an issue. Today with that issue removed I am only too happy to lend every ounce of energy at my command to the support of the Granger bill. It ought to be passed, in order to protect the future of the milk and dairy industry in this country. In the next few months the prognostication I have several times made will be borne out because the price of milk is already going down, and the threat to every dairyman in the country is paramount. They are in a precarious position.

In my district there are 30,000 rural mail-box holders, and I recently mailed a direct letter to every dairyman in my district telling them of my position in this matter. The 30,000 dairy families in the Thirty-seventh Congressional District of New York are not going to be faced with economic disaster if I can help it. I am going to vote to protect their interests in every way that I possibly can. You can accuse me of being sectional if you want to, but if I am guilty of that I willingly stand accused. because I am voting to protect those dairymen in the Northeast. There are 1,000,000 of them. Nearly one-third of the dairy farmers of this country come from the Northeast and the New York milkshed. I would consider myself lacking in responsibility to the people of my section of the country if I were to vote against this bill.

The dairy people of our milkshed have the responsibility of supplying the populations of the great cities of New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and all the up-State New York cities, as well as everywhere else in the Northeast where dairy products are used. Every man, woman, and child has need of them. We have the responsibility of supplying those people with the necessities of life. the staff of life, milk and other dairy We cannot go back on that products responsibility, we cannot go back for one instant on the responsibility to see that they are supplied with those vital necessities and foods of life.

I am not going to challenge the effectiveness of oleo as a food. The very fact that I opposed the tax on oleo last year when many others were for it is indication enough that I concede that oleo is a food. I am against a tax on any food because it is a tax on the poor man's pocketbook. He cannot possibly afford to carry such a tax.

I am going to leave this thought with you. There is a popular report running throughout the country today that the oleo barons are going to grab and absorb the difference in the tax on oleo when we repeal it today. I hope the country will rise up to protest if that ever happens.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'Sullivan].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, it is almost impossible to say or to do very much in 4 minutes but I shall make a try. At the outset, may I say I am in favor of the Granger bill, and I am in favor of it even though I am mindful of the provisions in the Democratic platform under the subject, Agriculture, the salient parts of which are as follows:

Pledges its efforts to maintain continued farm prosperity. * * Favors repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

These two platform planks are inconsistencies if you pass the Poage bill. You cannot work to maintain continued farm prosperity if you dish out to the two and one-half million dairy farmers what is contemplated by the Poage bill. But you can adhere to this platform by repealing the tax and helping these dairy farmers. You do not have to do any more than what the platform requires. I have always observed that when people try to do more than they are required to do-more than they are pledged to dothey always get in trouble.

I consider that I am a good Democrat and I am bound by this Democratic platform, but I am not bound by what the majority leader or anybody else says beyond what is contained in that platform. We are all out on open, common ground as far as this question is concerned about trying to make to oleo an outright gift of the color yellow which from the very first days of creation belonged to butter.

A lot has been said about the color yellow and it is urged that butter cannot appropriate it exclusively. I would like to cite something concerning what Lever Bros. have accomplished by way of appropriating a color-the color red. I shall quote from this document prepared by the Library of Congress. They are talking about Lever Bros.' great lawsuit where they sought to appropriate exclusively the color red. This document states that it is reported in Fortune magazine, in the November 1940, edition, at page 98, that Lever Bros. had a big lawsuit involving Lifebuoy soap, and that after about 10 years of legal battles, the courts ruled that Lever Bros., and Lever Bros. alone, was entitled to make a cake of health soap colored red.

Lever Bros. had the court sustain their right to have the only red toilet soap on the market.

I also call your attention to the fact that the Yellow Cab companies have the sole and only right to use the color yellow on their cabs. I had a legal experience along that line myself. In that lawsuit I thought it was ridiculous for a firm to take one of the colors and appropriate it exclusively for themselves. By a judgment rendered by a court of equity I found out that the Yellow Cab Co. has the sole right to use the color yellow on their cabs. This view was supported by dozens of court decisions in the United States.

You know, I am awfully afraid that there is a Britisher concealed in this legislative woodpile some place. I am sure that Lever Bros. has been carefully concealed behind all this propaganda for oleomargarine. I call your attention to the fact that I was flooded with oleomargarine letters from my district. I kept the letters and the envelopes and compared them. They were all written on the same typewriter and had at the bottom the same letters of the same stenographer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield two

additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. They all had the same watermarks. I sent them all back to Omaha, Nebr., and had them checked. I found out after a check had been made in my district that almost all of them were put out by a big national food concern, and that they were signed by employees and friends of this big national food concern. Of course, I gave that story out to the Omaha World-Herald and this propaganda was blasted into silence. Would you believe it? I never received another such letter. trapped propagandists did not even have enough sense to do what a bunch of criminals would have had sense enough to do when a great number of the gang are locked up. Everyone knows that for purely self-defense reasons all crime should not cease, but should continue at a greater tempo than before, because, if it ceases, then the police would know that they had everybody in jail who was connected with that particular type of crime. These fellows ceased their propaganda and I know why they ceased. The whole gang had been caught in one fell sweep.

I will not be able to finish these remarks, but I have taken the time to prepare some notes about Lever Bros. and Unilever, Ltd., of London, England, and practically all of the rest of the world. I have set out in these notes the size of this gigantic and mysterious concern; their terrific sales; how they penetrated into the United States and have practically taken over the soap industry: how they have recently bought, for \$16,-000,000, Jelke, the largest oleomargarine manufacturer in the United States, which concern is located in Chicago. I call attention also that in Fortune magazine of February 1948 it is stated that they-Lever Bros., and so forth-only intend to take 75 percent of any business they engage in, when General Motors only intends to take 45 percent of the business they engage in. I point out further a good many other things which will be important reading, perhaps, if you are interested in this Lever Bros., and so forth, venture, and really want to find out what malefactor is hiding in this legislative woodpile.

I then conclude my remarks by paying a personal tribute to Lever Bros. and Unilever, Ltd., which I wish you would read. It is not original. I just took another man's language and applied it to the particular case.

SIZE AND MYSTERY

The great international vegetable oil and oleomargarine cartel of Lever Bros. and Unilever, Ltd., is admittedly by far the world's greatest producer and distributor of the materials used in oleomargarine, in soap, and also of the finished product themselves. Very little published information is available on the

scope of the operations of this great cartel or of its sales and finances.

A cloud of mystery has shrouded all of What the world does its operations. know was learned only when some Government agency probed into its secrets or when a magazine like Fortune runs a series of articles as it did in December 1947 and January and February of 1948.

Fortune reports the basic reason for putting the great British and Belgian oil and soap combines together many years ago was to form a cartel that could control more than one-third of the entire world's output of all fats and oils.

Since the formation the cartel has grown rapidly. Fortune reports in January 1949 that Unilever's United African, Ltd., was the world's largest trading That company enterprise. raised \$6,000,000 worth of vegetable oil in 1946 alone.

How many natives employed as laborers at slave labor rates produced the vegetable oil this great British combine sells each year is a mystery. Fortune reports that the subsidiary operating in the Belgian Congo employs 40,000 natives, who produce 37,000 tons of palm kernel oilideal for oleo—in a single year.

DOLLAR SALES

Fortune presents its estimate of Unilever sales of oils, fats, and oleo in the year 1946, as follows:

Fats and oils	\$382, 262, 000
Oleo and edible oils	216, 621, 000
Soap	231, 000, 000

These huge totals, which were for the year 1946, give no indication as to the far larger current sales of this cartel. Yet they dwarf the comparable totals for oleo producers in this country as far as available information indicates.

LEVER BEOS. PENETRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Because Lever Bros. Co. carefully cloaks its activities of its oils and oleo producing units in this country under every legal veil available, it is not possible to show exactly the extent to which Lever Bros. has penetrated in the United States.

Fortune reported that Lever's American sales in 1946 were 45,000,000 English pounds, roughly \$200,000,000. Since 1946 Lever Bros.' sales have grown by leaps and bounds. The most significant recent development is Lever Bros.' purchase of the major American oleo producer, Jelke. Jelke's sales are increasing, too, and current trade reports indicate that this Lever Bros. subsidiary is one of the five or six largest American producers of oleo.

At the present time we do not know to what extent Lever Bros. may hold interest in other oleomargarine concerns nor do we know the number of vegetable oil processing units it controls directly or indirectly in this country.

SYNTHETIC PROTEINS

Fortune also reports that Lever Bros., growth in recent decades is based on "the fact that the cow and pig develop vegetable matter into fat inefficiently.' It reports how Unilever vast research and sales resources were mobilized to complete its current world monopoly of oleo and then Fortune says Unilever's research talents are now concentrating on synthetic proteins.

As a lifelong friend of the farmer, I resent these vast conglomerations of capital and chemistry which undertake to remold Nature's handiwork in their own synthetic image. If these men have their wish, the family-sized farm will be doomed as a way of life in this country. The self-reliant, self-sufficient production of the American dairy farmer is not good enough for these cold-eyed experts who juggle the markets of whole nations. They want to reduce everything to a system of valves and faucets, with only their own hands at the controls.

Their nightmare of a vegetable oil monopoly would wipe out the dairy cow as a producer of one-fourth of the food consumed annually in this Nation, and substitute soil-eroding crops. If that ever came to pass, the result would make the dust bowls of the 1930's look like the Garden of Eden by comparison.

Promotion of dairy farming can still save our fast-depleting soil resources. Every soil expert pleads for more grass, more dairying, more manure.

But the chemists of the oleo trust will hasten the wreckage of our land. Not only will these cartels and trusts ruin our soil-conserving dairy farmers—they will foster and encourage the crops that work havoc with the land and provoke

Mr. Chairman, this trend must be stopped before it brings to an end a livestock economy that is one of the proudest boasts of American agriculture, and tears down a system of food supply that has made our people the best-fed on earth. I, for one, am unwilling to surrender our centuries of gain for the profit of a few men in the financial districts of London and New York. The livelihood of 2,500,000 dairy farmers and their families is more important than the sales of 28 oleomargarine manufacturers, 5 of whom control nearly two-thirds of the total production in this country.

The bills contrived by the oleo cartel and the oleo trust would hit my own State of Nebraska a deadly body blow. Cows are milked on five out of six Nebraska farms. Livestock and dairying combined rank as our first industry.

Available reports show that there are more than 78,000 farms in Nebraska selling farm separated cream. These farmers have a direct cash interest in this legislation being considered here today. They want the Congress to vote for their farms and not for Lever Bros. and the great oleo trust in this country. If you depress butter prices by selling out to the oleo interest, five out of six Nebraska farmers will feel it and will tell you about it. They receive practically nothing from the sale of oleo materials and will not be helped if oleo sales trebled and quadrupled.

The entire Nation owes our Nebraska dairy and livestock farmers a vote of gratitude for what they have done toward correcting the soil damage of the dust-bowl era. Encourage them to continue to protect our soil. Do not force them to sell their cattle and go back to soil-depleting practices.

A great man once said: "The ancients had a saying that those who cross the sea change their sky, but not their mind."

No man can escape from himself and no business can escape from itself. The companionship is inseparable.

It has been said by good authority that the Britisher in this political woodpile is Lever Bros. and Unilever, Ltd. My investigations bear out that statement and in conclusion I want to pay my respects to this concern by borrowing some of the language of the great Kansas Senator, John J. Ingalls, reapplied by me to fit the occasion. This business institu-tion lacks all of the negative virtues of barbarism. It is one of the fallen angels of big business. To it duplicity is amusement, crowding others out of business a recreation, and the bankruptcy of its competitors a pastime. They pursue from purpose every object that should be shunned by instinct. It has the ferocity of a wolf, the venom of the adder, and the cowardice of a slave. The contemplation of its business deeds would convince the optimist that any system of morals would be imperfect that did not include a hell of the very largest dimensions. Its continued existence is a standing reproach to the New Testament, to the doctrines of every apostle, to the creed of every church, and to the detriment of American economy. In the business and political pharmacy of America it appears that we can find no antidote for this deadly poison.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, it is no accident that repeal of margarine restrictions has called forth probably as many or more bills in this Congress and the last as any other subject. I trust the Congress will act now to bring about such repeal for the reasons that I shall set forth. My aim is the removal of discriminatory restrictions on a pure food product that has been too long hampered by Government edict in the supposed interest of another product.

Last year the sale of yellow margarine became legalized in Maryland. In my opinion, the action was long overdue; but Maryland now has yellow margarine. What are the results? None of the dire things that some threatened would happen, have happened. Our dairy industry is as strong in our agricultural economy as ever. Our housewives are buying butter as freely as they bought it before, and our farmers are selling butterfat as freely as before. Our consumers are using yellow margarine and nothing disastrous has happened or is likely to happen. But they find they are taxed when they buy yellow margarine. They find it is not as available at food stores as they would expect it to be. And they demand that this Federal tax and re-strictions go the way of the old State

I also find that 30 States and the District of Columbia are in the same spot. State after State has been busy in recent years repealing and modifying antimargarine restrictions. This is right and proper. It is the exercise of States' rights—a most vital and fundamental principle in our democracy and constitutional government. A majority of States has exercised this right in making yellow

margarine available to their people. Yet, gentlemen, it is seriously proposed that Congress approve legislation that would absolutely prohibit yellow margarine everywhere. It is suggested that you overrule in the most arrogant way, and in the known interest of a product demanding special privilege, the freedom consumers enjoy in 30 States to choose between yellow-colored margarine and yellow-colored butter.

Seriously, can you gentlemen imagine the effect if the margarine mixing bowl is legislated right on the backs of the housewives of those States—not to speak of those other States in several of which strong movements exist to abolish restrictions on yellow margarine once and for all? I can. I know that in Maryland the reaction would be instantaneous and extreme.

Actually, it goes much further. The housewives in Maryland and in those other States that have repealed their outworn restrictions on yellow margarine have come right up against the present Federal law that taxes and restricts this product. Far from anticipating a return to the mixing bowl, gentlemen, these ladies are firmly expecting a repeal of the discriminatory taxes in the Federal law. In Maryland, for example, they have thrown out the ban on yellow margarine. Since then, they have been confronted with the Federal tax of 10 cents a pound on yellow, and the attendant restrictions. The result has been very plain. The demand for repeal of antimargarine legislation has not died down. Decidedly not. It has grown and grown. And, gentlemen, I can assure you that it will continue to flourish and nothing will make it flourish more than Federal legislation to outlaw yellow margarine.

The consumers of this great and rich country are not fools. They are using margarine because they like it and need They know, better than ever before, the real reason why the Federal antimargarine law still exists. They know that the butter interest, and that interest alone, has worked and worked to preserve this notorious monopoly. testimony presented before the Agriculture Committee and this Congress amply shows that. I doubt if there is any issue of special privilege that is so well known to our people today. The butter lobby is the complaint of everyone who mixes coloring into margarine. It is unfortu-nate that the dairy industry has attracted such widespread hostility in the minds of its customers but the fact is undeniable.

If you will review all that has been said on this subject before the Agriculture Committee and Congress, it will be apparent that no new basic argument has been advanced for the retention of any restrictions on margarine. The same arguments that for years have been set forth to keep taxes and restrictions are now being turned around to prohibit yellow margarine. The case for special protection for butter is no better than last year or other years, even though that case has been presented differently.

I submit that the real testimony on this subject should come not from one

certain group or another but from the group we are bound to remember. It is in the mind of the consumer who walks into the store and asks herself: "I can buy all food products in the form and color I desire them. The food industry competes to give me food products as I want them. Why is margarine the exception; why must I color my own margarine?" She shortly finds, if she has not already found, that the commercial interest, the butter interest, has sought to deny her yellow margarine. When she asks why, she is solemnly told that if yellow margarine is not restricted, she will be deceived and defrauded. But evidence on scores of pages of committee testimony refutes this tale. Practically all margarine is sold fully packaged and labeled-more fully labeled than butter in the matter of coloring-over the grocery counter. Here is not deception, but just plain, normal food sale. A small amount of margarine is sold through eating places.

The basic purpose of restrictions on margarine is to deprive. There is a philosophy behind the antimargarine arguments that is un-American. This is the philosophy that one industry is entitled to special treatment at the hands of Congress to the deprivation of all others and all consumers. It has been said frequently in the hearings that this is purely an economic controversy. is not by any means altogether true, in my opinion, although the proposal to ban vellow margarine makes it seem so. This is a controversy that invokes principle, the principle of no special privilege. But in another sense, it is truly economic. It is a thing that involves not only margarine consumers but butter consumersmore often than not, probably the same

It behooves the dairy industry to regard consumers as partners, not as a crop to be harvested. For whom are we primarily speaking? The great dairy corporations? The butter lobby? here make sure that we do not put ourselves in the unenviable position, in which I fear much of the dairy industry now stands on account of antimargarine activities, of saying to the American housewife, "You are a crop to be harvested by the butter industry."

Gentlemen, the evidence is before you. It is not new. It is a tale twice told; we know it well. No real proof has been made that the butter industry is entitled to restrict margarine. Much real proof is available as to the demand for yellow margarine. Let us today repeal Federal margarine restrictions-it is high timeand go on to the many other things that have a valid claim on our time and at-

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Jackson].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will [After counting.] Seventy-six members are present; not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names: [Roll No. 601

Polk Poulson Bates Mass Irving Bennett, Fla. Jacobs Powell Reed, Ill. Bland Jenison Bolton, Ohio Jennings Bosone Judd Regan Kearney Kearns Rivers Sabath Buckley, N. Y. Kelley Bulwinkle Sheppard Sikes Smith, Ohio Burke Keogh Coudert Kirwan Lesinski Cox Dawson Lvle Staggers DeGraffenried Lynch McSweeney Dingell Stefan Stigler Durham Macy Merrow Thomas, N. J. Fellows Morrison Wadsworth Morton Walsh Gilmer Welch, Mo. Gossett Murphy Whitaker White, Idaho Noland O'Brien, Mich.

Pfeifer, Joseph L.

Woodruff

Hart

Hébert

Hoffman, Mich.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the H. R. 2023, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 360 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal. The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Chairman, I favor the Granger bill, H. R. 2023, repealing the tax and license fees on oleomargarine, but prohibiting the transportation, manufacture, and sale of vellow margarine in interstate commerce. I congratulate the gentleman from Utah for the fine job that he has done, together with his colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. August H. Andresen! who is cosponsor of this legislation.

The State of Washington, during recent session of the legislature, enacted almost identical legislation to that which is now before the House, except it was limited to intrastate business. The State senate unanimously approved the bill. and the State house of representatives by a vote of 95 to 2.

The oleomargarine interests have long been asking for removal of taxes and sales restrictions on their product, which they have characterized as discrimina-They have maintained that no food product should be taxed, and that low-income groups are penalized by such taxation.

Leading dairy and farm organizations have freely conceded this point in at least three important annual conventions, and in literally hundreds of State and regional meetings. However, since the power to tax is the power to control, they have asked that some other regulation be applied to prevent widespread consumer fraud and deception in the passing of colored oleo as butter, at butter prices.

This new dairy policy toward oleomargarine, freely adopted by thousands of dairymen and farmers in local meetings and recommended to this Congress by the duly elected representatives of the organizations involved, calls for a ban on the factory-coloration of oleomargarine in semblance of butter. This request seems completely reasonable to me, and I believe that it should be incorporated into any new oleo legislation that is passed.

It is obvious that some means must be found to protect both consumer and farmer, who would suffer alike from the unrestricted sale of yellow oleo. consumer risks the possibility of outright fraud from unscrupulous dealers on the one hand, and a further reduction in our supplies of milk, meat, and similar dairy products, on the other. Both of these threats endanger equally the consumer's pocketbook and the national welfare.

The dairy farmer stands to lose, through unrestricted sale of yellow oleo, certain vital outlets for surplus milk. Cows produce more milk in summer than in winter, while consumption remains about the same. If we are to have yeararound supplies of milk, we are bound to have a certain amount of surplus milk from time to time. Last year 26.9 percent of all milk produced went into butter, which is properly called the balance wheel of the dairy industry.

The demands of the oleo interests that they be allowed to impair this outlet can only be interpreted as another attack on small business by big business. Unless this Congress is prepared to reverse our long tradition of encouraging smallbusiness men, it cannot logically sponsor the subjection of 2,500,000 dairy farmers to the selfish aims of a mere 28 oleomargarine manufacturers

Milk is produced on three out of four American farms and provides the largest single source of cash farm income. The dairy industry supplies more than a quarter of all food consumed annually in this country, and is an important mainstay of the family-sized farm in every one of our 48 States.

The oleomargarine industry, other hand, displays a regrettable tendency toward concentration, with 65 percent of the business in the hands of only five giant corporations. The volume of oleo business has almost tripled since 1941 without the help of proposed legislation that would give its monopolistic leaders the unrestricted right to imitate butter's naturally yellow color. I see no need for giving them further advantages over the farmer, to whom butter markets are an absolute necessity.

No one wants to deprive consumers of oleomargarine, and the bill I favor would make it freely available to every housewife in its most economical, uncolored form. However, oleo should be sold for what it is and not in imitation of butter. In that way the farmer would be protected against unfair competition from a substitute product, and we would continue to enjoy the supplies of milk and meat that have made this country the best-fed nation on earth.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield. Mr. CARROLL. I notice that H. R. 2023 has had its declaration of policy stricken from it. In that declaration of policy it, in substance, attempts to set forth the danger of sending oleomargarine in interstate commerce. I wonder what comment the gentleman has to make about the analogous situation that exists with reference to the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.
Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Washington one addi-

tional minute.

Mr. CARROLL. The eighteenth amendment to the Constitution attempted to prohibit the sale and transportation of liquor within interstate commerce.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think the answer to the gentleman's question is that in the case of the eighteenth amendment the action of the Congress was directed to intrastate prohibitions as well as interstate. This is limited entirely to interstate commerce, and I think it is constitutional. I believe the Congress has the right to prohibit transportation in interstate commerce of colored oleomargarine on the basis of fraud and the confusion that might exist in the minds of prospective purchasers. I think the legislative history, the hearings, and so on, will demonstrate the fact that such is the intent of the Congress. It may be helpful to have that declaration of policy in the

Mr. CARROLL. Does not the gentleman think the State governments are capable of exercising their own police power to protect their own citizens?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There is no infringement upon the police power of the States in this bill. This bill gives to the Federal Government a right which it always has had, namely, Federal police power in the movement of goods in interstate commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again

expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from

Missouri [Mr. Jones].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, since the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who favors the repeal of this unfair and discriminatory legislation, restricting the sale of oleomargarine, in his desire to be fair, has permitted those who are supporting the butter lobby to usurp approximately three-quarters of the time allowed in general debate on this bill, thereby precluding many of us who favor the fair and unrestricted sale of oleomargarine from expressing our views on the floor, I hereby respectfully request permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, for approximately 2½ hours I have listened to the general debate on the bills which seek to eliminate the unfair and discriminatory legislation which has attempted to prohibit and restrict the

sale of one of America's most popular nutritious foods. In the debate here this afternoon, we have listened to the prejudiced remarks of those who seek to favor one or the other of two great industries. At the same time we have heard little said about the principles involved in this legislation, and, in my opinion, too little importance has been attached to what I believe has been the paramount issue in this question. After more than a half century the butter lobby, realizing that it is fighting a losing battle, has finally agreed that all Federal taxes on oleomargarine should be removed, or more correctly stated, the butter lobby is attempting to lead the people to believe that it favors the elimination of taxes on oleomargarine, but at the same time would impose even more discriminatory legislation prohibiting the sale of yellow margarine in approximately two-thirds of the States of the Union.

To me the provisions of the proposed Granger-Andresen bill, H. R. 2023, as reported from the Committee on Agriculture, where the butter lobby apparently enjoys a majority with a one-vote margin, is evidence that the butter people know when they are licked and are now

seeking a compromise.

In my opinion, the American people, particularly the American housewives, are not interested in a compromise, and I feel that now is the time, and here is the place, to settle this issue once and for all on a basis that will leave no grounds for any misunderstanding. I believe that the following editorial taken from the March 8, 1949, issue of the New York Times sets forth most clearly the issue which is confronting Congress today, and for that reason I am including the editorial at this time:

NO MARGARINE COMPROMISE

Ever since Congress failed last year, in the rush of other business and election-year politics, to complete action on a repealer of taxes on margarine, the butter lobby has been busy dreaming up new strategy. Last fall it thought of the device of an outright prohibition against the making of yellow margarine. To this it has added the churning up of dire threats on what would happen if margarine were put on an equal competitive basis with butter, free of discriminatory taxes. We are told that communism would increase in the United States, that farm lands would be depleted more rapidly, that new dust bowls would be created, that the cow population would be decreased.

It is evident that the butter lobby is fighting a losing battle. But it lost that battle first on the housewife's market list. garine has been accepted by the American household as an acceptable, nutritious food that could be bought at a price considerably below that charged for butter. The declining tonnage of butter production and the increasing tonnage of margarine production through the years tell the story. As long as the butter producer cannot meet the price competition of wholesome margarine, margarine will continue to sell in large quantity. The heavy discriminatory tax on colored margarine has not succeeded in preventing the greater use of uncolored margarine, and neither will an unfair prohibition against coloring margarine at the plant, which the butter lobby now proposes in a compromise last-ditch fight in which they have at last conceded failure on the unfair

The public wants its margarine colored yellow. The butter producers themselves use artificial coloring, at least at certain seasons, to make the appearance of their product more attractive. The housewife is entitled to emancipation from the chore of coloring her own margarine in the kitchen. Enact whatever law is necessary to protect the consumer, in store or restaurant, from being deceived as to what he is buying. If the decline of butter consumption affects the public welfare through unduly depressing the dairy farmer's income, then let us attack that problem directly through general legislation. But let Congress, as a matter of principle, make a clean break from its long-time servitude to the butter lobby.

Why does margarine exist at all? Because it offers a needed food at equal or lower cost. That is a fundamental success principle in our economic system. Why has margarine steadily increased in consumer favor and become an indispensable item of the American diet-despite the restrictions the butter industry has mistakenly tried to heap on its legitimate competitor? Because margarine is a pure-food product-economical and nutritious. The dairy industry should take a longer look into its own yard. Consumers are doing so-and I may say that nothing has so stirred up interest in what the dairy industry is about, than the mounting demand for repeal of margarine restrictions.

When I was a boy, for example, milk was milk—full of rich smooth cream and accepted as such. Milk like that seems to have disappeared. Instead, your bottle of what is called whole milk today contains a prearranged and standardized amount of cream. You will not find it coming very far down the narrow neck of that milk bottle. Even certified milk, the best grade, requires cream content of only 4 percent. In my own State the requirements for cream content vary but they are not over this figure, yet Missouri milk in 1947 contained an average of 4.3

percent butterfat.

The name "whole milk" today is a legalized, watered-down myth, like the legalized myth of nonfat dry-milk solids, by which pompous torture of the language the industry really means dry skim milk. Obviously, it is profitable to withdraw part of the cream and put it into butter. Obviously, it is even more profitable if you can vote taxes on butter's competitor. It all fits into a pattern that, together with the fantastically complex system of pricing milk products. drives the consumer to an immediate and natural conclusion that the dairy industry is out to get her and that the wellheeled antimargarine propaganda is a concrete demonstration of that fact. When she learns that the butter interest alone wants margarine prohibited; when she is solemnly told that butter is somehow the basis for fixing prices on milk from which butterfat has been re-moved—she can hardly be blamed for finding vigorous fault and it is no wonder that dairy-industry leaders are faced with probably the worst case of bad industry public relations since the days of the trusts.

It has been interesting to me to note what many of the speakers have said with reference to maintaining dairy herds to provide the rich, wholesome milk for the youth of our Nation. Yet, today we find those who control the distribution and who fix the price have apparently forgotten the basis upon which they base their slogan that "milk is a food." They have continuously and consistently robbed milk of much of its food value in their greedy efforts to promote the sale of more butter, cheese, ice cream, and other products, and have thereby robbed the public of what it has a right to expect in whole milk. If the dairy industry wants to be fair, it will spend more time, effort, and money in publicizing the value of and encouraging the use of whole milk, and refrain from forcing the public to rely on skim milk with its low butterfat content.

It is common knowledge in my State and I think the practice is general throughout the Nation, that the larger distributors and processors of milk have entered into agreements among themselves to fix the price of milk, thereby robbing not only the consumer but the dairy farmer who is dependent upon them for an outlet for his product.

In the consideration of the legislation here today, I think Congress should be guided not by the claims which have been made either by the producers of butter or oleomargarine, but should vote for what is fair and just which will give the people an opportunity to purchase the product of their preference at the lowest possible price. In adopting the provisions of the Poage bill, I think we will go a long way in correcting an evil which has existed for more than a half century.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting and will vote for the so-called Granger-Andresen bill now before us. I take this position because it will protect the American dairy farmer against unfair competition by the oleomargarine trust. If colored oleomargarine is permitted to be shipped in interstate commerce, it is my belief that two and one-half million dairy farmers will be adversely affected.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, does three things: First, it removes all Federal taxes on oleo; second, it prohibits the movement of yellow oleo in interstate commerce; third, it permits the States to regulate oleo manufacture and sale within State borders.

Mr. Chairman, who appeared as witnesses for the great dairy interests of this country? I ask that question because we are known by the company we But here is the answer to the question: For the farmers-four dairy farmers, one representative of the dairycattle breeders, the dean of the largest agricultural college in Texas, one commissioner of agriculture, the organized dairy cooperatives, and all branches of milk-producer groups. Who appeared for the oleo group? No farmers testi-Who appeared fied and not a single representative of the oleomargarine industry. Further, not a single representative of the cottonseed-farming industry nor the vegetableoil-processing industry.

It is my belief and my conviction, Mr. Chairman, that the dairy farmer is entitled to have his product—yellow but-

ter—protected against yellow-colored oleo, which is colored to imitate butter.

The argument has been made the Poage bill protects against abuses that arise when unscrupulous merchants or restaurants sell oleo for butter. This is only a fond hope. Fraud and butter bootlegging occur in many States where the law prohibits such practice, but the evil continues at the expense of the housewife and those who eat in restaurants and hotels. Now the provision in the Poage bill which is designed to stop fraud will be no more effective than State laws that contain the same kind of prohibitions. The public will still be fooled under the Poage proposal.

Mr. Chairman, there has been no statement that I recall which gives us the facts on the cost of policing the prohibition against fraudulent sales of oleo. Obviously it will cost the taxpayers millions of dollars and there is considerable doubt that effective policing can be made all over this country.

I have the feeling, Mr. Chairman, the consuming public wants taxes removed. This is accomplished under the Granger bill. However, the public should understand that it may save some money in taxes, yet in the long run it may pay increased prices for fluid milk, meat leather, and many other family necessities that come from slaughtered dairy cattle. Dairy experts tell us that 25 percent of all milk that is produced goes into butter. If the farmer loses his butter market he will liquidate his dairy herd and when the supply of milk is thus reduced prices will rise; and so with the price of meat and leather.

Soil conservation is another important element to consider in this connection. The dairy farmer is constantly rebuilding the soil on his farm and he can do so when he has a fine herd of cattle. Today our Government is spending millions and millions of dollars on a soil-conservation program, so we recognize that this is a vital necessity if we are to have adequate supplies of food and fibers. We may rue the day when the dairy farmer loses his butter market to the Oleomargarine Trust because a few cents saved now may mean the loss of many dollars later on for farmers and the city people.

Milo K. Swanton, Madison, executive director of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, declared last month:

We in the business know that every dairy market and every product depends to a marked degree on how much butter is sold. When the substitute manufacturers, through a skillful campaign, increased the per capita consumption of oleomargarine from 2.4 to 7 pounds per capita, it meant the loss to the butter market of 700,000,000 pounds a year.

Unless the dairyman can protect the historic badge of yellow color for his product against the fraud of vegetable oil being sold with the dairy trade-mark, then we open the door all the way along the line for the sale of substitutes. And there goes the whole dairy market and the economic welfare of the dairy States.

He might well have said, "and the economic welfare of Rock, Green, Walworth, Racine, and Kenosha Counties"—all in my district, the First Congressional District of Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, the Granger bill should be passed and the Poage bill defeated for the reasons set forth above. The dairy farmer is entitled to all the protection this Congress can give him. Let us make the Granger bill the law of the land as a testimonial to the farmer who works with his herds from before sunup and long after sundown for 365 days of every year.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield for a consent request?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Sutton].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I personally would like to support the Granger bill for I have many dairy people in my district, and there are many dairy people in the State of Tennessee; but I do not feel that the Granger bill protects the dairyman at all, nor do I feel that the Granger bill protects the foranger bill protects the housewife at all.

Should this bill be amended on the floor whereby it will protect the dairyman and the housewife from fraud then I will support it 100 percent. In its present form I feel that it protects neither the housewife nor the dairyman. I hope the House will correct the evils of this bill, so that the dairyman, housewife, and the American people will be protected and in so doing I believe we could have a bill that we would be proud to present to our peoples.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I think the situation in the House this afternoon must be mighty interesting to the industrialists of the country and the world: To see the farmers of one section of the country fighting the farmers of the other section of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to any tax on food. That is the reason I have never yet in my life either in the legislature or in this Congress voted for a sales tax; unless I have some further light that I do not have now, I never will. I want the women of America to buy this oleomargarine as cheaply as they can get it. but under the provisions of the Poage bill and that of other gentlemen in the South who are interested in their products, it seems to me that you are preventing the housewives of America from buying this oleomargarine at the right price, because all it will do will be to bring profits into the hands of those who manufacture oleo. Just the moment they color it and send it out through interstate commerce into the various States of the Union the price of that stuff, experience shows, goes up from what it is actually worth by as much as 20 cents a pound. and these housewives will have to pay too much for oleo merely because it is colored. I wonder what they want to color it for anyway. It is the same thing, is it not, whether it is colored or uncolored? All of which makes me think of a partner I had in the law business at one time. He was a Democrat, and he was Governor of a Republican State for three terms in succession: he was a great man: he was Treasurer of the United States. He was not particular about anything, but his wife was fastidious. She said to him one day: "John, the fellow that brings that milk is bringing us dirty milk." "Well," John said, "that is all right; we have got to eat so much dirt anyhow in our lifetime." She kept digging after him until finally he got aroused. Mrs. Burke saw the milkman coming and she said: "John, tell him about that dirty milk." So John met him at the door and he said: "I don't want to make you feel bad or discourage you in your business, but if you bring the milk in one pail and the cow manure in the other we will mix it ourselves."

It seems to me that if the housewives can buy this oleo, take it home and mix it with yellow coloring matter they will get a cheap product in more ways than one.

I am willing to follow the advice of some of the good Democrats in this House. Just because you voted against me two or three times the other day does not change me from making the statement that there are some great Democrats left in this House. I am willing to follow the advice of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Granger], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Christopher], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Chatham], and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'Sullivan]. It seems to me they have made a better argument on this bill than I could make.

In North Dakota we are receiving the full blast of what you are doing in substituting this material, as our dairy herds shrunk 28 percent in the last 2 years. You are selling a substitute. It is the purpose of the manufacturers to sell a substitute that will take the place of butter. They intend to capture the butter market by selling a substitute. If I am in this Congress next time—I do not think I will be because I am going to run for the Bureau of the Budget so I can control the Congress.

It seems to me if the Congress passes the Poage bill it will simply put in the hands of the manufacturers of this material a chance to make huge profits off the housewives of this country. In the Granger bill they cannot ship that stuff out mixed. They have to ship it out raw, just the way it is. You know people like to be fooled and I think that will fool a lot of them. It looks like butter, it states like butter, and you say it is better than butter.

If I am here 2 years from now, do you know what we will be doing? We will be passing a law to substitute synthetic milk for the real thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Davies].

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one observation here this afternoon. It seems to me

we often forget very soon things that have happened in the immediate past. It is only about a year ago or less than a year ago when things were not going so well in Democratic circles. Things looked pretty bad for all of us. In fact, they looked so bad that the Democrats were handing out congressional nominations to political accidents like myself. It was at that low point that we had our convention in Philadelphia, at which the President made a speech. In that speech he said that if the farmers did not vote the Democratic ticket they would be the most ungrateful people in America. I think they proved their gratefulness because by the thousands they voted for the Democrats—Democrats like myself and Democrats in the Midwest. If we do not support the Granger bill, if we let these people down, we will be the most ungrateful political party in America. I do not want any part of it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, representing one of the northeastern dairy States, it became necessary for me, reluctant though I was to do it, to differ with my colleagues from other dairy States and to support in that committee, as I now support on this floor, the Poage bill rather than the Granger bill.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. The gentleman's State is not affected by this bill or the Granger bill or the Poage bill, is it?

Mr. COTTON. I say that every State is affected by these bills, and I will demonstrate to the gentleman in a very few moments that my State is vitally affected by the Granger bill and would be by the Poage bill.

Let us return, first, to the crux of this situation. As has been said by the distinguished chairman of the committee, you have before you three propositions; You have the Granger bill; you have the proposition which may be made that we simply repeal the tax; and you have the Poage bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Granger bill, of course, repeals the tax. The Granger bill is either a ban on yellow oleo or else it is not, and all this argument and talk about amendments that have been adopt_ ed and amendments that may be adopted comes down to one proposition, that if the Granger bill does not either prevent or make it exceedingly difficult to get yellow oleo in those States where people want it and the legislatures legalize it, then it certainly is no defense for the farmer, and if it does mean anything it means a ban on yellow oleo. That is indicated in the language on the third page of the Granger bill, and whatever may be the situation in some States, the State that I represent, which has no manufacturers of oleo and which, because of the fact that it is small and has not a large population, would probably never be able to support a manufacturing establishment for margarine

is, to all intents and purposes, banned by the Granger bill,

Mr. Chairman, knowing that the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire within a few days or weeks from now will vote on whether or not they will repeal the present State law which forbids colored margarine within that State, I could not in the committee or in this body cast my vote for a bill which says to my State and to its legislature. matter what you do, no matter how you vote, we override you, and you cannot have it." That is why I cannot support the Granger bill. That is one reason. I cannot support now, and I did not support 2 years ago, a proposition that would simply repeal the tax, because it is my belief that having for a period of 60 years maintained this tax on colored margarine—and I agree with everyone else that it is an unsound and improper approach to the problem, but it was adopted by Congress and maintained by Congress-and Congress recognized that the dairy farmers of this country are entitled to certain protection, and that their contribution both to the soil and to the country's economy is of sufficient importance to entitle them to consideration. I believe that when that tax is repealed, the dairy farmer is entitled to have some protection thrown around him to take the place of the tax. I do support the Poage bill. I support it because I think it is the fairest proposition that has been presented in this Congress for the consumer, the public, and the farmer. I believe it is fair because, first, it repeals the tax, and second, it endeavors insofar as it is possible, to differentiate and distinguish yellow margarine served in public places. cannot believe there is any great problem involved when the housewife goes to the store and buys a package of margarine to take home to use in her family. She can read printed on the package exactly what is in it. But nearly 40 percent of the meals in this country are consumed in public eating places. I believe that the dairy farmer has a right, Mr. Chairman, just as the manufacturer of tires has a right, to have his product distinguished. I believe the dairy farmer has the right to have his product distinguished and have us see to it that, when people go into a public eating place and a yellow spread is put upon the table, those who want butter and are willing to pay for it, and who constitute the market for the dairy farmers of this country, shall receive it. The Poage bill not only provides for a sign, and that, of course, might be put up behind a hatrack or somebody's coat, but it provides that every serving put on the table shall be either on a pastboard plate that bears the printing "oleomargarine" or shall be accompanied by a card that says it is I believe that is a fair oleomargarine. and just protection for the farmers.

If we are going to end this controversy which has been going on so long, if we are going to settle it we have to settle it right, and we have to settle it in fairness to all parties. It is for the advantage of the consumer and the farmer alike that it shall be so settled.

Do you realize, Mr. Chairman, that nothing has advertised oleo so much and hurt butter so much as this constant controversy? Oleo has been made a martyr of, and they have had free more advertising from these struggles in Congress and in the various State legislatures than could be bought by all the money they have spent and are spending for advertising.

So I suggest that for the advantage of the people and the farmer alike we relinguish the tax, we protect and distinguish the product, and, in addition, we protect the rights of the States. The Granger bill says to the States, "Even if you want oleo you cannot have it." The Poage bill does not say to any State, "You must have it." It still is within their power to say whether or not they shall have it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I should like to ask the gentleman this, because I think it needs to be emphasized. In my State we expect a vote next week on whether or not to lift the prohibition on margarine. As the gentleman has said, the Granger bill would prohibit the State of Pennsylvania from deciding that question. Is not that correct?

Mr. COTTON. I will answer that in this way. I recognize it is the sincere claim of the proponents of the Granger bill that a factory in Pennsylvania can manufacture and sell to the people of Pennsylvania yellow margarine, but let me remind you of this: On page 3 of the bill, near the bottom of the page, referring to interstate commerce, appears the language that commerce "includes the possession, transportation, serving, or sale (whether or not the first sale) of articles within a State."

Furthermore, when you realize that the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly xtended interstate commerce until it includes almost every kind of business, until the man who repairs an elevator in a building where an office is occupied by a firm in interstate commerce is himself in interstate commerce. and a lighthouse that throws its rays across a State line, even though it buys its electricity within the State, is in interstate commerce, then you can understand why I do not trust this interstate-commerce clause. I believe the Granger bill will only bring confusion.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. COTTON. I yield to the gentle-

man from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman was probably absent when it was said, and I stated it, that amendments would be offered to clarify that commerce section so there would not be any question about it. I am sure he feels I will offer that amendment.

Mr. COTTON. I appreciate that statement. I know that the gentleman from Minnesota, with his knowledge of the subject and ability, will do his best in that line.

However, this bill, when it is completed, will be either a ban on oleo or not. If it is not, it does not give the farmer the protection the Poage bill gives. If it is a ban, you can amend it all you want to, it is still a ban.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, it is a protection for the farmer because it stops the interstate shipment of vellow oleo.

It is not as much protection as I would like to have for the farmer. It does stop the shipment in interstate commerce and leaves it to the respective States to decide what they want to do in the sale of yellow oleo, within the State.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Once more, as in other years, we in Congress are receiving floods of telegrams and letters calling upon us to stand by the farmer or to fight for the consumer. Both are injured by this conflict, which will continue as long as discriminatory laws exist. Both will benefit when butter and margarine, clearly labeled and identified in the package and on the table, receive equal treatment by law.

I believe that most dairy farmers as well as most consumers want only what is fair and just. I believe the Poage bill is fair to both, and that is why I am for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the

gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to state that even if the Granger bill is amended so as to make it apply definitely and only to interstate commerce, we surrender oleo into the care and keeping of the several States, and deprive it of the protection that is now afforded by the Food and Drug Administration. Under such circumstances yellow oleo once within the borders of a sovereign State could be sold as butter and frauds without end could be perpetrated on an unsuspecting pub-That is the reason the gentleman who has just spoken has emphasized the fact that the Granger bill does not afford any protection against possible fraud. The cry of the butter industry from the beginning of this fight until the present time has been that they were anxious to protect the housewife and the American citizens from fraud.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield. Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman who is addressing you feels that the States can, by their State legislatures and State laws, properly enforce the law within the State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Combs].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, both sides of the question on these two bills have been discussed rather thoroughly on the floor. I wish to take this opportunity to explain my position. During the last Congress when the so-called Rivers bill was before us, I opposed it. I opposed it because it offered no protection to the American people in the way of identifying what they were eating at their table and in the public eating places of the country, or what they were buying in the stores. Colored oleo could have been sold for butter, and so served in restaurants.

I offered an amendment at that time which would have taken off every penny of tax, but which would have required the product to be identified all the way down the line, in grocery stores and on the tables in public eating places. The Poage bill does that. If the Rivers bill were here now, I would oppose it. But I find myself deserted by the people of the dairy States in going over to the Granger bill which would prohibit the shipment of colored oleomargarine in interstate commerce. But it would permit the manufacture, sale, and serving of colored oleomargarine within the State without requiring any mark of identification whatever.

In my judgment, the Granger bill, instead of protecting the American housewife and the American dairyman, would legalize fraud and encourage oleo bootlegging all over the Nation. As between the two bills I shall support the Poage bill, because it requires the colored product to be identified all the way down the line. It leaves the States free to take care of the situation within the State, which is proper. Any State can regulate the manufacture, sale, and serving of oleo within the State or prohibit it altogether, and the Poage bill removes all taxes on oleo and oleo dealers just as does the Granger bill.

So as between the two, it is the better of the two bills.

I want to add this. This is not the last time we will be considering questions of this kind, because these modern-age scientists are making all kinds of synthetic food products. They say they can make beefsteak out of sawdust. Down my way they are learning how to make sirup out of sawdust. They want to use it in making cattle feed the same as blackstrap molasses is used. The only trouble is that sawdust sirup kills the

As far as I am personally concerned, I will not eat oleomargarine if I know it. and I have a right to know what I am eating. The Granger bill gives me no such protection. I want butter, as far as I am concerned, and I want other natural food products, too.

A hearing was held here in Washington a week or two ago where some wise guy wanted permission to substitute a chemical for shortening in baking bread. The Germans used a lot of ersatz, and the children of Germany suffered on account of it. Now they are treating the German children for ailments caused by the use of ersatz. We are going to be facing that problem in the future.

During the last Congress when the Rivers oleo bill was under consideration and I was opposing it because it offered no protection to the dairymen or to the public by requiring identification of colored oleo, our friends from the dairy States here in Congress agreed with me and most of them I think supported the amendment I offered. My amendment would have removed the taxes but would have required identification of colored oleomargarine just as the Poage bill does. I am sorry to note that you fellows from the dairy States, who agreed

with me then in the necessity of protecting a natural product of the farm, butter, by assuring it fair competition with a synthetic product have abandoned that position and lined up behind the Granger bill which would bar interstate shipment of colored oleomargarine. There is nothing deleterious about oleo, though I do not want to eat it. It is a wholesome food and there are those who do want it and I want them to have it as cheaply as they can get it. I simply want to keep the American people free to choose and to eat what they want to eat. Let the butter people advertise their product as nature's own. Millions of American people prefer it and will buy it and use it. I am not afraid of oleo competition for the dairy interests of my district and my State if we shall insure by law that they will not be undermined by a synthetic product through deception and the fraudulent sale of an imitation product.

Civilized people everywhere have been eating butter since the day when the promised land was described as a land "flowing with milk and honey." People are not likely to abandon the habit of eating this wholesome food in exchange for an ersatz product. Let us keep the competition between oleo and butter fair and open as the Poage bill does and let the American people take their choice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Marshall].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take a few minutes this afternoon to review a little past history. I am a freshman Congressman. I am here for the first term. I do not know all the ins and outs of Congress. However, back where I come from and in the Midwest we have learned to appreciate what our friends in labor have done for us in an agricultural way.

There are a great many farmers in the Midwest who realize that they would not have had agricultural legislation which has been placed upon our statute books, and which has been good, had it not been for the support that the representatives of labor have given. I remember well during November how the farmers in the Midwest responded, and how the radio commentators said,"When the farm vote comes in, it is going to change the tide." The farm vote came The farm vote came in from the Midwest, and because that farm vote came in from the Midwest, the Nation took on a new lease on life. I was not here very long before I began to realize that some farmers in the United States did not have that appreciation for what the friends of labor had done for the farmers of the United States. I rather regretted the remarks of our very able majority leader recently when he said the farmers do not support legislation which the people in labor want. I wish to inform the majority leader, and others who may be interested, that the people here who are supporting the Granger amendment went right down the road with you 100 percent in supporting the kind of legislation which you wanted.

I could not help but notice that the fine gentleman who is the author of the bill being proposed to be placed on the statute books instead of the Granger bill seemed to be spending his time walking across the aisle, trying to make what appeared to me to be some sort of compromise. We are interested in legislation affecting the farmer. The farmers in the Midwest are looking to this Congress for legislation for agricultural legislation, for legislation which should be placed on the statute books that will provide the security in farm prices that they need and that they are expecting of this Congress. They did not like the uncertainty of the farm legislation that the Eightieth Congress placed on the statute books. They also do not expect to go along with a temporary extension of price support: they want an agricultural program that is a basic program, with some degree of security, one that they know contains some of the things that will stay; they do not expect Congress to make changes each year it meets.

The people of this country expect to have programs placed on the statute books that will take care of our health needs, our educational needs, our social-security needs; and they expect to have placed upon these statute books programs which will maintain our national revenue, our national income, that will give jobs to the workers in this country, and will provide a market for agricultural products in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, after long years of debate on the subject of margarine and butter, and after the long hours of debate in the committee and on the floor of this House which is now coming to a conclusion, I believe there are certain clarifications which can be made which will end anything in the way of confusion that may be loud the minds and decisions of some of the Members. If we look back just a little way in our history we will recall very well the days when nothing about margarine was all right; it was not a fit product for the American table. Gradually that argument was abandoned. Then it became a product which was discriminated against by means of excessive taxation. As we come here today we find the opponents of margarine willing to abandon that position. We find them willing to abandon every position except that they oppose the use of the color yellow in margarine.

Mr. Chairman, there must be some compelling reasons why as the years have gone by that the dairy interests have retreated from one position to another. I believe those reasons can be narrowed down to two: First, in a free economy such as ours it is simply not right that any industry be able to handicap another American industry. That truth simply cannot be hammered down. Secondly, there is another fundamental truth which has gradually beaten back the opponents of the free sale of margarine, and that is that the American consumer has the right to go into the

open market and purchase what he pleases with his own money. Mr. Chairman, these two points will continue to be the effective weapons by which the American people and a legitimate American enterprise will some day, and I hope within the next few weeks, achieve the right of every other American industry to do its business in a normal way free from handicaps imposed by any special interests.

Now, then, various minor arguments have come into this debate. There was the argument regarding protection from fraud, which I believe the Poage bill satisfactorily meets. There was the argument regarding the general economy. the argument regarding what is going to happen to the price of margarine, the latter leaving me under the impression that there is no law of supply and demand any more; at least not so far as this controversy is concerned. Mr. Chairman, the price of margarine will be determined as it always has been determined by the number of customers desiring the product and the supply of it available.

The matter of the health of our children has been brought up. Let me say that in recent years of our history there has never been margarine enough and butter enough produced to provide an adequate supply of fats and oils for the people of the United States. According to the United States Bureau of Health. we have never had in the combined production of both products an amount which they recommend for public health. Very frankly, I believe there is plenty of room in the American economy for both of these products. In my opinion, the American consumer should have the right to buy what he pleases and I believe the American enterpriser, who is just as much a taxpaver as anybody else, should have the right to produce and market his product in the free American

Mr. Chairman, I hope, therefore, that the Poage bill will be passed by this House and by the Senate so that we may have an end to this controversy and an end to this un-American handicap to an American business.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is familiar with the Poage bill. May I ask the gentleman if he does not think the Poage bill contains just about every conceivable protection against possible fraud?

Mr. CORBETT. I honestly believe the provisions to protect the consumers and the producers of butter are too severe if anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Wier].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, for further identification, and due to the fact that there has been some statement made on this floor regarding the position of labor, I might make known the fact that for the

past 25 years I have been identified officially with the American Federation of Labor in the city of Minneapolis. I have had a close relationship in my position in the labor movement with the very essential industry of agriculture and dairying. So I want to say that the oleo interests are wrong in believing that they have the labor vote in their pockets.

Mr. Chairman, their demand that they be given the unrestricted right to color oleo yellow in imitation of butter threatens the jobs of 10,000,000 Americans who depend upon the dairy industry for a living.

Labor has nothing to gain from such people and everything to lose. In the dairy industry labor is thoroughly organized. Union wage earners include the employees of 3,500 local creameries and 40,000 plants turning out additional dairy products in every one of our 48 States. For example, the dairy industry is the largest single user of motor trucks in the world. Their drivers have a direct interest in the outcome of the butter-oleo controversy, but automotive workers also have jobs at stake. So have the thousands of employees of the dairy supply and equipment companies.

By comparison only a handful of workers are employed by the 28 oleo manufacturers in this country. Five of these corporations control 65 percent of the oleo business.

It is only common sense for unions to oppose anything that will dislocate the dairy industry, because once such dislocation starts it can reach into the pocket of every wage earner in the United States. Milk is the largest single source of farm income, and only prosperous farmers can buy the products of union labor.

When farmers have to sell their dairy herds and turn to other occupations because of unfair competition for surplus milk outlets union labor loses its best customers. Moreover, about 40 percent of our beef and veal come from dairy herds. There is no advantage in risking scarcities and higher prices in those lines in return for doubtful promises of cheap oleo.

Union workers in my district feed their children plenty of milk, meat, and butter. That is one reason why I am today taking the floor to lend my humble efforts to protect the dairy interests.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to present a few facts to show why the dairy industry has a rightful claim to the traditional yellow color of butter.

The dairymen want to protect their inherent right to the yellow color of butter and they want to protect the consumer from unsuspecting purchases of yellow-colored substitutes. Dairy farmers are perfectly willing to compete with a tax-free butter substitute on the market. They ask only that oleo be sold in its uncolored form.

Dairying is the mainstay of agriculture and has been since man first domesticated animals. Dairy products are the diet mainstay of every American family. You have all heard children run into the kitchen and ask, "Can I have some bread and butter, Mom?"

I am sure that most of you made that request yourselves many times when you were younger. Maybe some of you still do. But do any of you ever remember hearing a child say, "Can I have a slice of bread and oleomargarine, Mom?"

When a child asks for bread and butter, he trusts his mother to give him real butter and not an imitation colored the traditional yellow of butter. The same is true of the adult consumer when he orders butter in a restaurant or buys it in a store—he wants the real product and not a substitute dyed yellow in imitation of butter.

I repeat that yellow is the traditional color of butter. Ask any child of kindergarten age the color of butter, and he will tell you that it is yellow.

Butter has not been yellow just since the Civil War, or since the War of 1812, or since the Revolution. It has always been yellow. The phrase "I know which side my bread is buttered on" is first recorded as an old English quotation in a book published in 1546.

Butter is not a product that came on the market in the last few years. The Democrats or Republicans had nothing to do with its origin, and neither did big business or modern synthetic chemistry. If you could turn back time 100 years or 200 years, or even 4,000 years B. C., you would find people milking cows or other animals and making butter.

Our history books tell us that the written history of man does not reach back to the beginning of the domestication of cattle, nor is there any record of the date when cows' milk was first used or when butter was first made.

We do know that, wherever civilization has flourished, people have depended largely on dairy products for a balanced diet. One of the oldest buildings unearthed near Babylon by the University Museum of Philadelphia and the British Museum, reveals a milking scene that had been sculptured on one wall. This building is believed to be 6,000 years old.

The Egyptians, whose civilization is believed to date back to 4,000 B. C., left many pictures showing the use made of cattle in their day. Cattle herding, breeding, and dairying were common to them. The Greeks, who had herds of cattle themselves, often referred to Italy as a country of cattle. History records that tribes from northern Europe invaded Italy and appropriated not only the arts and culture, but also the industries of that civilization, which included the art of butter making.

Quoting from the Bible, we read in the Book of Proverbs, chapter 30, verse 33, "Surely the churning of milk bringeth forth butter." This and other references to butter in the Bible suggest that butter has a very long tradition.

Let us turn to our American history. Is there any child who has not learned that the first colony was established in Virginia in 1607, and that the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth in 1620? Jamestown imported its first cattle in 1611, and by 1618 had 300 cattle. The Plymouth settlers existed 3 years without cattle, but the mortality rate of infants was 50 percent before the sailing vessel Devon made its way to their shores with three cows in 1624.

What were the last items our greatgreat-grandfathers tied on the backs of the prairie schooners before they started their long treks toward new homes. They were the old wooden butter churns, and the family cows.

An unabridged dictionary shows various species of flora and fauna with names derived from the dairy product because they were yellow, like butter. There is the buttercup, so called because of its butter-yellow color; and the butter-and-eggs plant with its flowers of yellow. There is the butter bean, the butter weed, the butterfly, and the butter head, naming only a few. The names are all derived from butter because of their color. As far back as English literature can be traced, the color yellow has been associated with butter.

It is true that the tint of butter may vary with the seasons, but it is always yellow. It also is true that butter is dyed during a certain season of the year, not for the purpose of deceiving the consumer but to keep the product uniform. Butter-real butter-can be identified at sight only by its naturally yellow color. For this reason dairy farmers have always sought to protect their livelihood and the consumer's pocketbook against butter imitations colored yellow in semblance of butter. Yes, yellow is the color of butter; but to the oleo interests, yellow is the color of gold. Oleo seeks to imitate butter for profit.

There are no similar substitutes for other basic food products. There is no such thing as an imitation potato, for instance, or an imitation egg, or an imitation loaf of bread. The dairy industry does not seek to deprive anyone of oleomargarine, provided the substitute is sold for what it is and not in the guise of butter. For this stand the dairy industry has sound legal precedent.

I would like to quote from a letter published in the Washington Evening Star of January 13 and written by Charles M. Fistere, legal counsel of the American Butter Institute:

It is a fact well known by food enforcement officials that there are certain basic deceptions which are sometimes employed in the preparation of foods which are not correctible by any form of label statement. The use of artificial color for the purpose of simulating a valuable food probably is the foremost example of this type of deception.

The Food and Drug Administration, throughout its rulings, has been sensitive to the deception caused by the use of artificial yellow color in foods which makes them appear to contain eggs. The use of yellow color is forbidden in such foods as macaroni and noodle products, mayonnaise and salad dressings.

The circuit court of appeals has upheld the Food and Drug Administration in its contention that white poppy seeds, artificially colored to resemble more valuable Dutch blue and Turkish grey poppy seeds, are adulterated.

In a 1940 opinion, the Food and Drug Administration said, "bakery products, or any other food containing pumpkin, which gives the appearance of having an egg content when no eggs are present, or a greater egg content than is the case, would be an adulterated article under any form of labeling."

Artificial coloring may not be added to tomato puree or other tomato products.

A truthful label statement that artificial color has been added would not be a successful defense to a charge of adulteration in any of the above illustrations. Yet, inadequate

regulation of yellow oleo would relegate any of the above foods to the "chicken feed" class as a source of booty to the unscrupulous because of the large margin of profit involved and the closeness of the resemblance of yellow oleo and butter in appearance and taste. * * *

The sound principle upon which the dairy industry's policy is based was once expressed by a Food and Drug official who, after 30 years' experience in protecting consumers from deleterious foods and economic fraud, said, "It is our experience in law enforcement that the purchaser is guided many, many times in the identity of a product by its flavor, its appearance, its physical properties, regardless of what statements are made on the label, with respect to artificiality or coloring, as the case may be; and it is one of the fundamentals of law enforcement procedure that such effects, resulting from appearances and flavors, when they are deceptive, are not correctible by label declaration."

Oleomargarine manufacturers have been allowed to imitate the taste of butter by adding diacetyl. They have been allowed to add preservatives such as a benzoate of soda, which are not used by the butter producers, in order to keep their products palatable until it can be They have been allowed to fortify their butter substitute with vitamin A in an attempt to approximate the nutritional value of butter. They have been allowed to imitate the texture of butter by adding skim milk to their product. They have been permitted to illustrate their advertisements with pictures of pastures and barns to suggest the wholesome freshness of butter.

Speaking of advertising, the soapopera crowd that controls a large part of oleomargarine production in this country has not limited its bad taste to phony use of farm scenes, to squeeze an extra bit of profit out of the misled consumer. It has recently made unauthorized use of the name of a famous actress. a southern girl, who is the daughter of a former Speaker of this House, and the niece of a former United States Senator. to advertise another of its products. For this the soap-opera boys are very properly being sued for a million dollars in damages, proving that there are limits to which commercialism can go in borrowing names and attributes of others to peddle a synthetic product. If good taste and dignity and the virtue of quality still have any meaning in this country. I invite my southern friends among the Members of this House to take another look at the company they are keeping by supporting the oleo side of this controversy. Those are things that the South has always held dearer than mere money, but the soap-opera crowd puts profit first and other things second.

The fact remains that the dairy industry has a tremendous bearing upon the national economy, and upon the national welfare in matters of health and diet. Dairy products comprise more than 25 percent of all food consumed annually in our Nation. More than 10,000,000 Americans are dependent upon the dairy industry for their livelihood, including those in allied industries and the families of employees.

There is still a need for protecting them, and for safeguarding the housewife against fraud and deception. There is still a need to protect the restaurant patron against yellow oleo served as butter. More than 65,000,000 meals a day are served in the Nation's restaurants. Diners who get oleo instead of butter are being cheated, and so are the youngsters who ask their mothers for bread and butter and get bread and oleo.

Each year since 1940 American agriculture, in spite of all handicaps, has come through with larger and larger crops—these in times of most acute world needs. Now the time has come for readjustments and a return in larger measure to the soil-conservation program adopted as a national policy by the Congress and administered by the United States Department of Agriculture. In this connection we can paraphrase Oliver Goldsmith:

Ill fares the nation to hastening ills a prey, where the soil wastes and family farms decay.

Remember, there is as yet no synthetic food.

A good farmer has been defined as one who leaves the soil better than he found it. The record proves American agriculture is manned by good farmers who understand how to build up their land through grass pasturage and livestock. Grass is nature's contribution to soil conservation. It binds the soil and protects it against water and wind erosion while at the same time it adds to the nitrogen and humus content and improves its tilth.

The dairy cow is the instrument of agriculture that puts grass to its most effective use in the maintenance of mankind, conveying it into the most perfect foods for humans yet developed—milk, butter, cheese, and meat—plus useful by-products such as casein, leather, medicinal extracts, bonemeal, and so forth.

Butter for years has been the gold standard of the dairy industry. Based on its value are the prices of all other dairy products. Injure or destroy the market for butter, and you injure or destroy the dairy industry with all its wide ramifications in our national economy.

Our Government, through the Congress, has set up a program of price control for farm products; that on butterfat is more than four times that on vegetable oils. The oleo interests seek to come in and take the domestic market with a substitute colored like butter and absorb the difference in profit. We know that they are already doing this in States—like Texas—that have legalized colored oleo.

Well may the oleo interests advertise in national magazines that "far-seeing men in Washington are looking after your interests." If this scheme of the oleo interests goes over, the American public will more clearly understand what is meant by the "The smoothest spread."

If the oleo interests succeed in their demands for the unrestricted right to imitate butter, dairymen will undoubtedly take up other lines of agriculture because of the necessity to reduce their losses. But may I say to my southern friends, that already nearly 40 percent of the substance of margarine now comes from soybeans, which are more and more developing as a cash crop wherever corn can be grown, which is from the Cana-

dian border southward. There are other oils, not domestic in origin, which are even better for oleomargarine manufacture, and which cost less.

In my opinion, the South could best serve its local interests by promoting its own dairy industry, rather than by sponsoring the imitation of butter, with all the avenues for fraud thus opened. No present Member of Congress was here when the first tax was placed on oleomargarine. These taxes antedated the present pure food laws and may not have been as good an approach to the subject as the pure food laws adopted later. Certainly the tax-free policy toward oleo now urged by leading dairy and farm organizations is a sound approach to the subject.

The responsibility of Congress to protect the American people against fraud is still paramount, and for that reason I say—no tax, no color—no color, no fraud.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, the implications of a complete and unconditional repeal of the oleo tax are clear. The intention of the oleo manufacturers is not to assist the producer of domestic vegetable oil. Rather it is to import cheap foreign vegetable oil to the disadvantage of the domestic producer of both animal and vegetable oil. The Granger bill should be sustained.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LeFevre].

Mr. Lefevre. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2023 presently under discussion, brings again to our attention this great subject of oleomargarine. It was just a little less than a year ago that we spent hours here in the House arguing whether or not it was right and proper to tax margarine. At that time I took the stand that the tax was discriminatory. Food prices were high. Butter was really a luxury and when the average person had all he could do to meet his food bills, it seemed most unfair to force this extra tax on the consuming public.

From what I have been hearing today, I believe practically every man and woman in the House agrees that the tax should be repealed. The question that seems to draw the most fire is whether to limit the regulation authorized under the bill to yellow oleomargarine in interstate commerce. The bill as written, if I properly interpret it, will permit yellow oleomargarine to be produced or colored locally and made available to consumers in those States where laws permit yellow oleomargarine to be manufactured, colored, and sold.

Unless something comes up during this debate to alter my present views, I believe this is the fairest way to settle this very controversial problem. Many of us here and many more back home are convinced that our State and local governments should get back into the picture and assume more responsibilities affecting the welfare of the people. If we ever intend to stop this growing bureaucracy it is high time we work toward that end. I believe this bill as written suits the

majority of the people in my district. The tax was the issue they considered unfair.

In my section of New York State the great majority of the farmers are dairymen. As I said last year, and I shall repeat it now, I do not believe that the removal of the tax would mean the ruination of our dairy herds. The bulk of the milk produced in the Thirtieth District of New York State goes into the so-called fluid market. We have to look at the problem fairly. I do not believe my farmers were too concerned last year and in many instances told me that I voted as they would have, favoring the repeal of the tax for the benefit of the consumer.

In New York there presently is a law prohibiting the sale of yellow margarine. If and when the people want that changed they have the privilege to so inform their State representatives. As stated before I believe this bill before us looks fair and I expect to support it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Keefe].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an important question that is before the House. After having been here for 10 years, I often wonder why we call this general debate, when a mere handful of the Members are here on the floor of the House to listen to this discussion.

I can say that I have approached many questions with an open mind, and I have been delighted to sit here during this entire debate and hear the argument that has been produced especially by some of the new Members who are serving their first term in Congress. There have been statements and arguments made on the floor of this House this afternoon that ought to be convincing to any Member of Congress who would sit here and participate in these debates, and they ought to be here and hear these arguments. The gentleman from Nebraska, a great lawyer, made a magnificent statement and gave arguments that are unassailable and unanswerable in support of the Granger bill. The gentleman from Minnesota who has just left the floor made a magnificent statement as representing the views of labor on this proposed amendment. The gentleman from New York in a very few words made a magnificent contribution, as did the gentleman from the Midwest, one of the new Members, and no better statement was ever made on the floor of this House than was made this afternoon by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who talked from the standpoint of a practical farmer.

In opposition to all that debate coming from the Democratic side of this House, I heard one voice raised in opposition and that was the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], from the city of New York, who failed utterly to answer the arguments that were advanced by Members on this side.

I heard the argument over the platform and heard the argument in the debate between the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Granger] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], both of whom claim they sat on the resolutions committee at Philadelphia when the Democratic platform was adopted. There appears to be a wide divergence of opinion on the Democratic side as to what the Democratic platform intended to do, but I think a fair résumé of that debate would lead anyone to the conclusion that it was the feeling of most Members on the Democratic side that what they intended to do was ask for the repeal of taxes on oleomargarine. That is what is done in the Granger bill.

I come from Wisconsin, it is true. That is a great dairy State, and I would be derelict in my duty as a Representative of that State if I did not take the floor to protest the potential threat which is involved in the total debasement of our food supply. I want to say a word of warning to the gentleman from Texas and the people from the Southern States who originally were prompted by sectionalism into thinking that they are protecting the cottonseed-oil industry by supporting this antibutter legislation. I want you all to know-and I want you who are thinking of soybeans to knowthat we are experiencing a revolution in this country which is taking place right before your very eyes. The people of America are not aroused and are not awake as yet to the danger facing the nutrition of the people of this country by the constant debasement of our food supply. I made a speech a few days ago talking generally on this subject to a mere handful on the floor of the House. Do you think I was talking about something that is not true? I hold in my hand the excerpts of a speech delivered yesterday by the chief of the fats and oils branch of the Production Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture at Urbana, Ill., where that gentleman was talking to the processors and producers of soybeans, and he took the very language of the address that I made here on the floor of the House and called the attention of his audience to the threat which exists to the people of this country by the utilization of chemical substitutes to supplant vegetable and animal oils throughout the entire baking industry of the country.

What he said as to soybeans goes as to cottonseed oil and peanut oil and all the edible animal fats and oils. What is happening? You are going to vote to legalize interstate shipments of oleo—a product which, with the addition of synthetic vitamins and the use of animal and vegetable fats and oils, makes a completely nutritious product.

What happens next? When Lever Bros. carry out their plan to ultimately substitute chemicals for nature's foods, can you see what the future holds? After they have the unlimited right to ship yellow-cclored oleomargarine throughout the country, the next move will be to substitute for the natural fats and oils which they are now using the synthetic products which I can identify

and which are being sold today to the extent of millions of tons in the manufacture of soap, which has ruined the inedible fats and oils market. Do you have a rendering plant in your district? I have one in my town. It is closing up; it is going out of business. Why? Because they cannot sell to the soap manufacturers any longer the inedible fats and oils. They are being supplanted by chemicals manufactured by the great chemical companies of this country.

Gentleman, it is time to think. Let us not inject narrow partisanship into this situation. We are dealing with a highly volatile subject. We are dealing with something that reaches the very heart and soul of America, and that is the debasement of the food supply of the Nation. This debasement, so far as oleomargarine is concerned, is just one of the multiple steps that I could tell you of as a result of the intensive research that I have been doing in this field.

We ought to stop and ponder and not give too much attention to the little pitiful arguments that are being made as to butter and oleo. The subject is bigger than that. You will live to rue the day that you took this step. You producers of cotton-seed oil, and you producers of edible fats and oils, you producers of soya oils and peanut oil will be coming to this Congress before long asking the Congress to protect you against these chemical substitutes that are now available and on the market. The gentleman from the Fats and Oils Division yesterday told of the inroads already being made, which threaten to put the soybean industry out of business. Millions of pounds being sold today that cost 12 cents a pound, and they are getting from 55 to 65 cents a pound for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. KEEFE. Can not you see the question that is involved? I am going to speak from time to time in this Congress on this subject, because I have interested great scientific minds in this country in the field of nutrition and I am in constant contact with them. I do not propose to see that the great advances we have made in the field of public health and nutrition are destroyed because a few people have larceny in their hearts and think more of mere dollars than they do of human welfare.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. The gentleman mentioned the Democratic Convention. The Democratic Convention evidently endorsed the action of the Republican Congress in passing the legislation last year.

Mr. KEEFE. Now the gentleman is just injecting a little sour note of politics that is very petty, indeed, and characteristic of him in his debates on the floor. I have tried to point out the situation that you will come to realize some day. You may not realize it today. The housewives of America will realize it when you foist onto them food of all kinds, canned and processed, that will debase their food supply, and when they wake

up they will turn the lash upon those who are responsible for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again ex-

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Cali-

fornia [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to this debate today. I wonder if the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] would at this time suffer a few questions. I would like to ask the gentleman if his bill repeals the discriminatory taxes on oleomargarine.

Mr. GRANGER. That is true. It re-

peals all taxes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All Federal oleomargarine taxes?

Mr. GRANGER. And all licenses.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Your bill also allows interstate and intrastate shipment of uncolored oleomargarine?

Mr. GRANGER. That is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It does not change the present situation at all?

Mr. GRANGER. Except it takes off tax. That is all. It makes it free.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I mean in regard to the shipment of uncolored oleomargarine.

Mr. GRANGER. That is right. Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that any oleomargarine manufacturer may place a factory in any State which allows the sale of colored oleomargarine at the present time, and sell the colored product within that State?

Mr. GRANGER. That is true, provid-

ed the State law permits it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. As I understand, there are 16 States now which prohibit the sale of colored oleomargarine within that State.

Mr. GRANGER. I do not know

whether it is 16 or more.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Sixteen or seventeen.

Mr. GRANGER. Approximately that. Mr. HOLIFIELD. They comprise many of the large States, such as California. I know California does not permit the sale of colored oleomargarine within the State.

Mr. GRANGER. That is true. The peculiar thing about it is that every person who has spoken on this bill today in opposition to it has come from a State where they could not sell it in that State if all the taxes were repealed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In other words, it is a problem on the State level in most

of the States.

Mr. GRANGER. Including Califor-

nia. That is true.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. What I want to know is what is wrong with having a mixing plant in each State. Does that not offer employment and decentralize industry?

Mr. GRANGER. I think it does. think that is a very pertinent question, because it would make those people who are getting the benefits come down to the county and State level and help pay some of the taxes that other people have to pay. Make no mistake about it, in every one of these States in the Union millions of dollars are invested in dairy plants and cheese factories and what not.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On that particular point, is it extremely costly for an oleomargarine plant to be set up to do the coloring and mixing of white oleomargarine?

Mr. GRANGER. I do not know about the cost, but certainly it cannot be great.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It stands to reason it would not be if the housewife can mix it in a bowl with this coloring matter. It could be colored in the butter-mixing machines they have in all the butter factories. The same kind of mixing equipment can be used in each State without a great deal of expense.

Mr. GRANGER. That is right. There is no reason why it cannot be done; the

gentleman is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is absolutely true that the Granger bill fulfills the Democratic platform pledge to repeal the discriminatory Federal taxes on oleomargarine.

Mr. GRANGER. If anybody can put any other interpretation on the Democratic platform than I am putting on it, I would like to know. I should like to read the platform.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I should like to hear

the plank read.

Mr. GRANGER. The plank reads:

We favor the repeal of discriminatory taxes on the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine-

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is what the gentleman's bill does?

Mr. GRANGER. Yes.

Mr. HOLIFIFLD. The gentleman's bill actually does that?

Mr. GRANGER. Absolutely. Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to hear the gentleman answer this question.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield. Mr. SUTTON. Does the gentleman from California realize that the manufacturing plant in California will have to shut down should this bill be enacted into law?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Did the gentleman say it would have to be shut down?

Mr. SUTTON. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. They can ship it out of the State; they cannot sell it in the State.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You can ship colored margarine out of the State and white margarine in the State.

Mr. SUTTON. So it does not prevent

the sale of it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They cannot ship it within the State; that is very true; but that is a matter for the State legislature. Nor will the law of the State of California permit colored margarine to be sold within the State if the Poage bill is adopted.

Mr. SUTTON. Then those plants in California will be shut down.

Mr. GRANGER. That is not true at all.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That may be so; they can still ship outside of the State and sell outside of the State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. This little demonstration which we have just witnessed and which was obviously rehearsed before it was enacted prompts me to say that it is a feeble redemption of a sacred platform pledge to repeal the tax and outlaw the object upon which the tax has been imposed. I do not believe that it was the purpose of my party nor of Mr. GRANGER'S party to go before the country with any such flimsy pretext as that.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I decline to yield. The very idea of intelligent men sitting in a convention of that importance and adopting a platform pledge such as this, and to go before the public saying they are in favor of repealing this discriminatory tax and not telling the same public in all these same meeting places that just let them get down to Washington on this platform and they would repeal the tax but would outlaw oleomargarine. They say: "We will pass a Republican bill if you just let us get in on a Democratic platform.'

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I yield to my

friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I should like to ask the gentleman what the plank on oleomargarine was of the Dixiecrat branch of the Democratic Party. We have heard the Democratic platform plank, and the gentleman has indicated that there were two divisions to the party.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not attend the Dixiecrats' convention and I have never been classed as a Dixiecrat. I believe that I am just as good a Democrat as

will be found anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New

Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, at this juncture I should like to recall to the House the words of Champ Clark when he was debating the Panama Canal tolls question here on this floor some decades ago. These were his words:

Tell it not in Gath, proclaim it not in the streets of Ascalon, that the Democratic Party will not keep faith with its platform.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I was not injecting politics into this thing when I was speaking to my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I was just giving him an out, pointing out that the Eightieth Congress was not quite as bad as everybody thought it was, because one of the few things it had courage enough to do was to face the margarine issue on the floor of this House. As far as I know the bill that was passed was not as acceptable as the present bill or as the substitute to be offered later.

I hear a great deal about Lever Bros. I do not know anything about them. The inference is that there seems to be something evil about that institution. I thought we all believed in private enterprise. If Lever Bros. is a large company, is that wrong? Is that wicked? The United States Steel Corp., I understand, is rather large. The United States Tire & Rubber Co. is a large institution. There is big business in this country today and I do not know why any stigma should be placed upon a company just because it is big.
Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman believe in international cartels and mo-

nopolies?

Mr. HUBER. . Mr. Chairman, I believe in free enterprise. All the patron saints of the Republican Party are continually talking about free enterprise. Now, if someone can produce a healthful, nutritious food, let them produce it. Let us not put all these Government regulations on it. I am tired of Government reglations and unfair Government practices. Let us get back to the fundamentals of Americanism. Let us allow free enterprise to take its course. I venture the assertion that you ship a greater amount of beer in value out of Wisconsin than you do dairy products. If anybody tried to stop you from shipping Schlitz beer into the States of Ohio or Pennsylvania I am sure you would cry crocodile tears. But, of course, this is margarine-it is wrong; it is evil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Mur-

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is easy enough for people who have nice jobs, with political ambitions, to be facetious about this situation here today. Well, I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman that what we do here on this legislation has much to do with the future of at least one State out of the 48.

There is nothing new about this legislation. From a reading of the newspapers you would think that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. August H. Andresen] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] were doing some conniving, were doing something unfair, they were doing something tricky, they were bringing in trick legislation. Mr. Chairman, 25 years ago there was passed a filled milk bill. The filled milk bill is exactly the same as this bill here in principle. Filled milk is composed of a vegetable oil and skimmed milk, just exactly the same as oleo is. All the Granger-Andresen bill does is to put oleo in the same class that the fluid milk is in today and has been for a quarter of a century.

You may be interested in knowing that this is just the beginning. There is another bill here in the hopper that is going to do the same thing on filled cheese. You know, I have an awful job keeping track of people down here in Congress for some reason or other. I went down here with my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] to appear before the Washington Advertising Club, and I do not know of anyone who has

made more money out of the oleo argument than the advertising people have. Unthinkingly, I mentioned the fact that they had a little lawsuit down in Texas in which it was brought out that they were using filled ice cream. Well, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] gave me quite a lecture—he is a good friend of mine-and sort of intimated that it was not any of my business what kind of ice cream they ate in Texas. He asked if I believed in State rights. When the committee agreed that we should have a States' rights provision in this legislation, I thought maybe it would be all right to have States' rights as far as oleo is concerned.

Now, anyone who is shedding tears about protecting the public-and we have heard it twice here this afternoon on both sides of the aisle-just let us not deceive ourselves, because it is not being followed right here in the city of Wash-They made an investigation ington. within the last 60 days, and out of 150 restaurants in one southern State they found only 15 of them that were following the law. So what is the use of having that kind of law on the statute books. The Granger bill passes this back to the States, the same as the filled-milk bill does. Take Illinois and Indiana, if they want to eat it, that is their business, and that is what the Granger bill is trying to do with this law, and that is what we are trying to do with cheese, and that is what we are going to try to do with ice cream. Since all these people have so many tears for the consumer, I would like to take these 11 minutes and talk about labor, because, after all, they are the ones that are going to pay the price on this as far as that is concerned.

And I want to call your attention to another product, another concoction, and I would be glad to make it here for you. and we cannot talk about another city in the United States, because we have nothing to say about it. I made it for you last year here. You take 96.5 percent of skim milk and 3.5 percent of vegetable oil and you practically have oleomargarine. The only difference between that and oleomargarine is the difference in the proportion of the fat and the oil. I can make it for you for 5 cents a quart.

Another point has been omitted here. Surely, the oleo people have been able to sell their products cheaper. Why? Every pound of oil in oleo in the last year has been subsidized. I am not saving that the oleo manufacture is being subsidized, but the United States Treasury is subsidizing the product. There are some of these oils that the United States Government under the program has lost 22.2 cents per pound on, and I would not like to guess what they are going to lose the next year for certain oils that they are supporting. So, it is not a matter, my good colleagues, of any little, petty thing. The whole dairy industry is involved.

When our good President this last fall ran on the Democratic platform, he might have said he was going to get rid of the tax, and I think everyone realizes he wants to follow the platform, but I just cannot believe that any President, President Truman or any other President, wants anyone to be interpreting his mind

to show what he wants to do in connection with the dairy business.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I would just like to say that while the Democratic platform called for the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine, it did not demand the destruction of a \$250,000,000 dairy industry in the United States. I do not believe that of my party, nor of my candidate for President who is President now.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman, because I cannot imagine any President wanting to do that.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I have been here for 4 or 5 hours listening to this debate. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] says that the Democratic platform says one thing; the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] says that the Democratic platform says another thing, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SUL-LIVAN] gets down in the well of the House and says the Democratic platform says another thing. I would like to know what does the Democratic platform say.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Well, I do not want to get into that angle any more than to say that I have more confidence in President Truman than to think that he would deliberately destroy the dairy industry of this country or to

be a party to so doing.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to make just one observation, and that is that the Democratic platform was just read a moment ago by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GAVIN. Well, I was not here at that time.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Just so that we can interject a little bit of levity into this serious situation, may I say to the gentleman that this debate regarding the Democratic platform reminds me of a story that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Dough-TON], told yesterday about the colored fellow who was ambling along the road down South twirling a rope. Somebody came up to him and said, "Say, what are you doing with that rope?" He said, "Mr. Ned, I'se confused, I'se confused. I don't know whether I'se found a rope or lost a mule." I thought it was just about like some of the confusion we find here on the floor of the House in discussing some of these questions.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As far as the dairy industry is concerned, if you follow the law-and incidentally it is not being followed now, but I do not want to get that injected in here; we think it is going to be—the man who owns the cows is going to be taken care of. There is no argument about that.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Sabath] today was telling about dollara-pound butter. The gentleman is a year behind, because a couple of days ago Uncle Sam had to buy a carload of butter out in Minnesota at the support price of 59 cents. So as far as the man who milks the cows is concerned, he has some protection.

Let me ask you today whether or not you want to step up the number of unemployed in this country. One of my good southern friends came to me a few days ago and said, "You know, all us fellows from the farm districts ought to get together on that wage-hour bill when it comes in. We ought to keep it just the way it is, as far as it affects the farmers." He said, "You must have lots of cheese factories and creameries and milk plants I said, "Sure, I have in your district." plenty of them." He went on to tell me a story, and I said, "Now, Brother, there is something going to happen before we get that far. Just don't make me feel badly about what is going to happen to that minimum wage or maximum hours, or anything that goes with it, because how do I know, when they get down to the oleo bill, whether or not they are going to have any jobs? So why should I worry about what wages they have when I do not know whether they are going to have a job or not?"

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. I honestly have not made up my mind whether to vote for the Granger bill or the Poage bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is a creeping thing, but in the gentleman's State they have reduced cow numbers by 22 percent in the last few years. If you want to be in the dairy business in Oklahoma, you want to keep that in mind

Mr. MORRIS. I appreciate that suggestion. I honestly have not made up my mind whether I am for the Poage or the Granger bill, or for either. I realize the gentleman is an authority, especially in the dairy field, and I say that seriously. Does the gentleman care to tell us at this time whether he is supporting the Poage bill or the Granger bill, or is opposed to both of them? I should like to have the gentleman's suggestion about that.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I took it for granted that the gentleman knew I was for the Granger bill, because I have been recommending the Granger bill

here several times.

Mr. MORRIS. I have heard the gentleman's speech on this occasion, but I did not know definitely which bill he is for.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The Granger bill is a fair bill. The dairy industry has gone too far now with the Granger bill. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. Granger] has bent over backward.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman's judgment is, then, that the Granger bill is about as good a bill as could be written on this subject? Is that the gentleman's thought?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It gives the Government back to the people. If the people of the State of Oklahoma want to eat oleo that is red, blue, yellow, or any other color, that is their business. The longer I am in Washington the more I realize that we have to give these things back to the people and back to the States.

Mr. MORRIS. I was not arguing with the gentleman. I was asking for information. I just wanted to get his

judgment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We have done it on evaporated milk and on filled milk. We should do it now as far as butter is concerned. We should do it all the way down the line as far as the dairy industry is concerned.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws is in the interests of the consumer.

It is my feeling that the housewife wants the privilege of buying yellow margarine already colored in her grocery store. She should be given that privilege.

The Granger-Andresen bill is illogical and confusing. There is a question as to what it actually does. It may not only ban interstate shipment of yellow margarine but also intrastate shipment of yellow margarine. In any event, the measure should be defeated.

The arguments against repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws fall rough-

ly into two categories:

First. That repeal would destroy the dairy industry.

Second. That a ban on yellow margarine is necessary to prevent fraud and destruction.

I do not think the prospective destruction of the dairy industry thesis needs extended argument. Mr. Poace of Texas discussed this subject at length a day or two ago. For those of you who want the facts and figures on this matter I refer you to page A1856 of the Congressional Record of March 29.

Mr. Poage points out that the butter interests are riding on the back of the dairy industry and I feel that he is right.

The butter industry has shifted ground quite a bit on this question of margarine and these shifts reinforce the conclusion that what the butter boys really want is something to cripple margarine.

All Members of the Eightieth Congress remember well how it was asserted that without keeping the Federal taxes and license fees the entire dairy industry, let alone the butter part of it, would be ruined.

Now, it is conceded, apparently, that no "fraud" of consequence will result if taxes are removed. But it is claimed, now, that large-scale "fraud" will result if yellow margarine is not prohibited altogether. While it is likely that this claim has been made for the purpose of buttering the butter industry's public relations—a desirable goal—it is put forth seriously and deserves a serious reply.

Where is the proof of the claim that margarine, sold yellow under existing pure food laws, would result in wholesale deception? There is no proof. Two years or so ago, the butter people here in Washington put out a little booklet attempting to make the claim by telling the six so-called cases where margarine had been sold for butter. The material in this book has been repeated recently in one of their publications. Yet the six cases show quite the opposite. They go back to 1900: the recent cases are very few; little margarine is involved; the story is ingeniously woven of scraps of fact larded with slices of fictional treatment intended to scare rather than inform.

This report is headed:

"Six Actual Cases Showing How the Internal Revenue Bureau Helps Protect You Against Food Racketeering."

It was introduced into the record of the House hearings on margarine during the Eightieth Congress by Mr. Charles Holman, of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. It will be found on page 285.

Now, however, Mr. Holman and other butter spokesmen apparently have decided that the protection of the Bureau of Internal Revenue no longer is needed

by butter.

Where did the whole idea of deception in margarine orginate anyway? The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that, when the law was originally passed, in Grover Cleveland's time, margarine was newly introduced in this country. It was only at the beginning of its development as a modern product, just as butter at that time had not entered the era of modern big-creamery production and distribution. Most important, our pure-food laws were still 20 years away. It was a new problem. The butter people were quick to see the advantage of an argument of deception. The law was passed, chiefly, because we did not then know how to regulate in the pure-food area except by restrictive taxation.

All that is now changed, of course. We have our pure-food laws, and good ones. They are working—if you have any doubt of it, consult the Food and Drug Administration's record of seizures, including butter—which, incidentally, far outranks margarine in that respect. Today we control foods through the pure-food laws—we encourage the production of more food under pure food standards, rather than restrict. This applies to all-foods

What are the facts?

Butter freely uses artificial coloring to give its product the yellow hue which pleases consumers. If you doubt that statement, look at the butter color advertisements carried in the dairy journals.

Butter then freely uses artificial coloring but wishes to deny that privilege to a competitor.

And here is something which seems to be the crux of this whole situation. About 93 percent of all margarine is sold through stores to householders.

The labeling requirements are such that there is no danger of deception in this field. These requirements would not

be changed by repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws.

About 3½ percent of all margarine is sold to bakers and confectioners.

There is no danger of deception in this field. The bakers and confectioners do not care whether margarine is yellow or white.

Thus, there is no danger of deception in the case of approximately 96½ percent of all margarine sold in the United States today.

The butter interests claim that some margarine is sold as butter in public eating places. But even they do not claim that these violations include more than 1 percent of the margarine sold in this country.

If there are violations in this field why not get at them directly as is proposed in the Poage bill, H. R. 3 and other pending repeal bills.

The Poage bill, for example, requires the identification of each separate serving of margarine in a public eating place. Furthermore, it requires, in addition, that if a public eating place sells margarine that it place up a placard, or sign, stating the fact, or that it put a notice to that effect on the menu.

Penalties for the provision referred to would be made a Federal offense. The enforcement of the provision would be placed with the efficient Food and Drug Administration.

Bear in mind, that the bills which would prohibit the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine contain no such provision. The danger of violations in public eating places, if yellow margarine is banned, would remain as it is now. For it would be a simple matter for any restaurant owner who wished to violate the law to color his margarine and sell it as butter.

I fail to understand why the housewife is to be forced to continue to mix color into margarine simply because there is danger that an occasional restaurant owner may sell margarine as butter.

The proposal is unreasonable and illogical. Common sense demands that it be rejected and that the Federal antimargarine laws be repealed.

I, of course, agree that oleomargarine should not be permitted to defraud the public at the expense of the dairy industry and the public. I do not believe that the protection of the public from such practices by prohibiting the sale or transportation of colored margarine in interstate commerce can be justified unless we go all the way and prohibit the transportation of squirrel coats colored to imitate mink or citric acid soda pop colored to imitate orange juice and hundreds of other situations. I do believe that restaurants that use margarine should clearly advertise it as such on the menu and when colored margarine is sold in packages, it should be designated as such.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Granger].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.
Mr. MORRIS. I am seriously seeking information on this matter, because it is an important matter. Will the gen-

tleman express himself to the Committee at this time as to whether or not he thinks the provisions of his bill forbidding the transportation of oleomargarine in interstate commerce would be difficult of enforcement? That is one question that is bothering me.

Mr. GRANGER. No; I do not see that any difficulty would arise to prevent the enforcement of the act.

Mr. Chairman, we are coming to the close of this debate on what I think is a very important question. I am interested in this matter, not from any personal advantage that I may have, but because I am tremendously interested in the perpetuity of a branch of agriculture that has been the mainstay of the farm family. You would be alarmed if you had the figures on the great movement toward commercial and corporation farming. It is alarming to know of the vast acreages of wheat, potatoes, and cotton that has gone into the hands of a few operators, where in many cases the operators are not even residents of the places where the farms are located. So I ask you to consider this matter very calmly, because I am tremendously interested in that phase of our economy. I dare say many of you people here on the floor, as is true in my case, were able to go to school because dad and mother were willing to milk the cows and take the cream to the creamery so that the proceeds of the check might be distributed to the kids going to school.

Further than that, farm family life is a breeder of good citizenship. I dare say that on our farms, generally, and the dairy farms in particular, there never would be sown the seeds of communism or any other ism having for its purpose the overthrow of the Government. I think it is important that we maintain the farm families. It seems to me that to do otherwise would be striking a death blow at the thing that we cherish as a sacred heritage of the American people.

Instead of spending the millions of dollars they have spent in order to imitate butter, if these oleo people were really and honestly trying to make a product of their own, they could have used any number of other delicate colors which would make their product just as palatable and pleasing as the color of butter. There is nothing in the color itself which makes the product any different. It does not change the food value of the product. It is a determined effort on the part of these people to imitate butter and sell it for what it is not. I think if they had spent their money in trying to convert the people of this country to the use of oleo, they could have used another color. And I am not saying green, pink, or any other color, but I am saying that they could have used some other color to distinguish it from butter and then we would have avoided this controversy. I think there is a determined effort being made to destroy the butter industry, which will have a tremendously damaging effect upon the economy of the dairy farmer. In good times and bad, the dairy farmer has been one who could hold his head high and not be forced to depend upon relief from his neighbor, during times of depression. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 9½ minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it is little wonder that the gentleman from Wisconsin confessed his confusion at the present state of affairs. The legislation now before us is well calculated to confuse anyone and it seems to have confused its proponents as well as all the others.

These proponents have suggested that this legislation would in no wise reduce the enforcement of the present law. But I hold in my hand a letter, not written before this bill was brought out, but 9 days after it had been brought out, after it had been referred to the Federal Security Administration, Pure Food Division, over the signature of P. T. Dunbar, Commissioner of Foods and Drugs, in which he points out that section 2 (c) of this bill-and 2 (c) is a section which was not supposed to be amended—uses the words "affects, obstructs, or burdens commerce or the free flow of goods in commerce." He points out that under the interpretations of our courts that clearly would require prohibition of the sale or shipment of any goods anywhere that did affect or interfere in any way with interstate commerce. I fear and Mr. Dunbar fears that this bill may in fact prohibit the sale of colored margarine even in intrastate commerce. Now, if it does not, if you apply the interpretation applied by the last speaker, that it does not interfere with interstate commerce, then you have no hook upon which to hang the enforcement sanctions of the Pure Food and Drug Act, which applies only to interstate commerce. If this bill does not affect intrastate commerce, if it affects only interstate commerce, the sale of margarine produced in the State of Texas within the State of Texas is not involved in interstate commerce and then the Pure Food and Drug Act has no control over the purity of that commodity. The sale of any colored margarine that could be sold under the terms of this bill could not be supervised as to purity, as to quality, or as to any of its ingredients. would be no Federal pure-food law to protect the consumer of yellow margarine under the Granger bill.

I call the attention of all those who profess to favor pure foods to the fact that this butter bill clearly, and, according to the opinion of the Commissioner of Foods and Drugs, provides that he would have no control over intrastate movement. If you sell margarine produced in a State, under the terms of this butter bill as its author just told you he interpreted it, then you could sell it with any kind of impurities, and there is no law on the Federal statute books and there is not a word in his bill that would provide for any pure-food regulation.

Now, I believe the consumers are entitled to some protection. Most of this afternoon has been spent in discussing the effect this would have on the dairy people. The dairy people are entitled to consideration, but not to the exclusion

of all the other people of America. There are three classes of people affected. The first class might be the producers of cottonseed and soybean oil. I do not want to plead their case. I am willing to waive any interest they may have in the measure. I have not stood here and argued on this bill in their behalf.

The next class interested in this bill are the dairy people, of course. You have heard a great deal of discussion about the effect this will have on the dairy people. You have heard the assumption that my substitute H. R. 3 will greatly injure the dairy industry. you have not heard one single speaker this afternoon, nor will you hear one single speaker explain to you how my bill will hurt the dairy industry or how any bill giving the American consumer freedom of choice and assurance of selection will hurt the dairy industry. in one breath, "If you sell yellow oleomargarine it will take the market for butter." In the next breath the original author of this bill, the man who introduced this bill and who then stepped aside to take the curse of Republicanism off the bill, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has explained how you were going to put the dairy people out of business.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I am sorry. I have only a couple of minutes left.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will explain how it will work.

Mr. POAGE. I cannot yield to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman has had his time and has discussed his point of view that my bill would destroy the dairy industry.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then I will answer the gentleman tomorrow.

Mr. POAGE. Then in the next breath the gentleman told us that it would result in a higher price for margarine. I do not know which side he wishes to stand on. Either H. R. 3 is going to result in the sale of a cheap table spread that the poor people of America, who cannot afford to pay the high price of butter, can and will buy, or it is not going to affect the sale of butter at all. Does the gentleman believe that, if this results in the sale of yellow margarine at the same price as butter, that the American people will select margarine in preference to butter? I have never made any such contention. I believe the masses of the American people will take butter at the same price, but most of the American people do not have the 73 cents a pound that it takes to buy butter. That is the reason most of the people would buy margarine if they had the opportunity. It will not take butter off the market. It will mean that those families that now cannot buy a table spread will be able to buy one. That has been the experience of every nation in the world.

The greatest dairying nations in the world are the Low Countries of Europe, Holland, Belgium, and those countries; yet those countries all sell more butter per capita than does the United States and all of them sell from three to four times as much per capita of margarine,

yellow margarine, if you please, as does the United States.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I am sorry, I cannot vield

Every one of those countries in Europe that allows the free sale of yellow margarine sells more butter per capita than does the United States. Does that look like it would hurt the dairy people of the United States if we, too, allowed the free sale of margarine in any form the consumer wants it?

What about the States of the Union that have tried to impose restrictions on margarine, as so many States of the Union have? The State of Iowa has a prohibition against the sale of yellow margarine, and yet last year, 1947, the last year for which I have the figures, butterfat brought 82 cents a pound in Iowa. Missouri, an adjoining State, has no restriction on the sale of yellow margarine, and butterfat brought 90 cents a pound in Missouri. Go just west of them: The State of South Dakota entirely prohibits the sale of yellow margarine, and they got 73 cents a pound for butterfat. The State of Nebraska, adjoining South Dakota, prohibits it only in public-eating places, and they got 79 cents a pound for butterfat. The State of Kansas, adjoining Nebraska, has no prohibition against the sale of yellow margarine, and they got 83 cents a pound for their butterfat. Even the farmers of the great State of Wisconsin, on one side of the great market of Chicago, got 2 cents a pound less for their butterfat than did farmers in the State of Indiana, on the other side of that great market.

Going to the East, no man can say that there is a better market than the great city of New York. The State of New York prohibits the sale of yellow margarine. The farmers of the State of New York got \$1.24 a pound for their butterfat in 1947. In the little State of Rhode Island where they do not have the great city of New York, in the same year without any prohibition against the sale of yellow margarine they got \$1.60 a pound for their butterfat. Does that look as though this prohibition against free enterprise, against the right of the consumer to select the foods that he or she wants to buy, does that look like it would wipe out the dairyman? It has not done it; there is no evidence that the dairyman has ever been helped by these restrictive laws.

But the dairyman is not the one to be primarily concerned with; certainly the consumers of America, the 140,000,000 people who should be buying fluid milk and consuming the product of the dairy farm in its most valuable and most acceptable form are to be considered also.

In the final analysis there are but two fundamentals involved. I submit, any American citizen has a right to buy any pure food in any form or color that the purchaser wants and is willing to pay for. Second, the purchaser has a right to know that he gets the identical product he thinks he is buying. The Granger-Andresen butter bill violates both of these fundamentals. It prohibits the sale

of yellow margarine in interstate commerce and denies the consumer the choice of products to which he is entitled. We might as well prohibit the sale of Ford cars in a State which does not have a Ford factory. It gives absolutely no protection to the consumer from the deception which the butter people have so long claimed to fear. On the contrary, it withdraws the protection of the Federal Pure Food and Drug laws.

H. R. 3 gives every citizen the right to buy margarine in any form he wants it, but it requires that every separate serving of yellow margarine be definitely identified as such. I think this is fair. I shall offer it as a substitute for the butter bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] has so well established by his speech that there are now legal and adequate methods to protect the public in the nutritive standards of oleomargarine, at least when shipped in interstate commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has ex-

pired.

The Clerk will read. The Clerk read, as follows: Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. Yellow oleomargarine resembles butter so closely that it lends itself readily to substitution for or confusion with butter and in many cases cannot be distinguished from butter by the ordinary consumer. The manufacture, sale, or serving of yellow oleomargarine creates a condition conducive to substitution, confusion, fraud, and deception, and one which if permitted to exist tends to interfere with the orderly and fair marketing of essential foods in commerce. Such transactions in yellow oleomargarine, whether intrastate or interstate in character, burden, obstruct, and affect commerce, interfere with the production of goods for commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce, and constitute an unfair method of competition in

It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to correct and eliminate the conditions above referred to; to promote the orderly and fair marketing of essential foods in commerce; to prevent confusion, fraud, and deception in commerce; and to prohibit practices which burden, obstruct, or affect commerce, the free flow of goods in commerce, or the production of goods for commerce.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Whittington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, and to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS OF REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 2101, to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection. Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2101) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagree ment to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title, and agree to the same.

> HAROLD D. COOLEY. STEPHEN PACE. W. K. GRANGER. CLIFFORD R. HOPE. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Managers on the Part of the House.

> > ELMER THOMAS, GEORGE D. AIKEN, MILTON R. YOUNG, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, ALLEN J. ELLENDER.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2101) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause in the House bill and substituted provisions, the effect of which are (1) to abolish the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., (2) to transfer its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture, and (3) to authorize the Secretary to make loans to farmers and stockmen for any agricultural purpose in any area or region where he finds that a production disaster has caused a need for agricultural credit not readily available from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible sources.

The House bill authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans or advances farmers and stockmen in the event of eco-nomic emergencies or where the forces of nature have caused production disasters. The House bill also placed a limitation upon the amount of money authorized for administrative expenses.

The Senate amendment adopted by the conferees does not provide for as broad a loaning authority as was provided in the House bill. Under the House bill the Secretary of Agriculture through the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation would have been authorized to provide credit to farmers and stockmen in any economic emergency whether or not the need for credit was attributable to a production disaster. the Senate amendment which was adopted by the conferees, loans may be made available only when the Secretary finds that a production disaster has caused a need for agricultural credit and that such credit is not readily available from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible sources.

The House bill authorized an expenditure of not to exceed \$750,000 for administrative expenses. The Senate amendment authorizes the Secretary to utilize the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, for the making of loans and for administrative expenses in connection with such loans and places no limitation on the amount of the authorization for administrative expenses. However, the Senate committee in its report (Rept. No. 89) indicated that the Secretary of Agriculture should, under the terms of the Senate amendment, be able to carry out the program with less cost.

> HAROLD D. COOLEY, STEPHEN PACE, W. K. GRANGER CLIFFORD R. HOPE. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MACK of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the secretary of State of Illinois and a resolution concerning the Lincoln ordnance depot.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include ex-

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee and include tables and statistics.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VORYS (at the request of Mr. HOPE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. Hope) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. Bosone (at the request of Mr. GRANGER), for March 30 and March 31, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution

of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3910. An act to extend for a temporary period the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act; and

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to maintain the status quo with respect to the exemption, from the tax on transportation of persons, of foreign travel via Newfoundland.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3910. An act to extend for a temporary period the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act; and

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to maintain the status quo with respect to the exemption. from the tax on transportation of persons, of foreign travel via Newfoundland.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 1, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

479. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of \$92,619,888 for the various departments and agencies (H. Doc. No. 149); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

480. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States, covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

481. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting the Ninth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States on the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, N. Y., for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on House Administration.

482. A letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, National Military Establishment, transmitting the Annual Report on the National Industrial Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

483. A letter from the Acting Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information covering the interna-tional information activities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

484. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a supplemental finding of feasibility for the Platoro Reservoir as the first unit of the Conejos division of the San Luis Valley reclamation project, Colorado (H. Doc. No. 150); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2369. A bill to authorize an

appropriation to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.; without amendment (Rept. No 359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3088. A bill to increase the compensation of certain employees of the municipal gov-ernment of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3856. A bill to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion; with amendments (Rept. No. 361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judi-ciary. H. R. 3875. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, with respect to suspension of deportation of aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 32. An act for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; with an amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 750. A bill for the relief of Lee F. Bertuccioli; without amendment (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Theodore Papachristopoulos; with amendments (Rept. No. 358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 3925. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of constructing a channel through Topsail Inlet, N. C., to the inland waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: H. R. 3926. A bill to rename a game sanc-

tuary in the Harney National Forest as the "Norbeck Wildlife Preserve," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture. By Mr. CAVALCANTE: H. R. 3927. A bill to make it a crime for

any person, as part of a plan to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence, to incite contempt for such Government by the use of publications, motion-picture films, or radio broadcasts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 8928. A bill to incorporate the Guild of Carillonneurs in North America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3929. A bill to provide for the mobilization of the scientific resources and knowledge of the United States for the purpose of seeking the causes and cure of cancer, heart disease, infantile paralysis, and other diseases of mankind; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3930. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILL: H. R. 3931. A bill to authorize certain additional allocations of costs of the Colorado-Big Thompson Federal reclamation project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KILBURN: H. R. 3932. A bill to exempt artificial limbs from duty if imported for personal use and not for sale; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 3933. A bill to permit Federal employees who retired before April 1, 1948, to elect to have their annuities computed on the same basis as Federal employees who retired on or after such date, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 3934. A bill to permit religious or charitable societies to import musical instruments free of duty in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 3935. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 3936. A bill to strengthen the national defense by making it possible for persons drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law 759, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) as well as all other personnel to choose the type of units in which they serve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H.R. 3937. A bill to provide for a survey of physically handicapped citizens; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 3938. A bill to prohibit interstate commerce in imitation cheese, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3939. A bill to prohibit interstate commerce in imitation ice cream and in imitation ice milk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3940. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to regulate the transportation, packing, marking, and description of explosives and other dangerous articles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOAGE:

H. R. 3941. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain buildings surplus to the needs of the Veterans' Administration to the State of Texas for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a State medical college and State hospital; to the Committee on Veterans'

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3942. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3943. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in rheumatism and arthritis, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy and epilepsy, and other diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 3944. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: H. R. 3945. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to museums operated or conducted by the Federal Government, the several State governments, or political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 3946. A bill to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 3947. A bill to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Shasta View irrigation district, Malin, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3948. A bill to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Okanogan irrigation district, Washington, and to authorize its execution and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3949. A bill to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Kittitas reclamation district and to authorize its execution, to approve the reclassification of lands within the Kittitas division of the Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H.R. 3950. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Uncompander Valley Water Users' Association and to authorize its execution, to approve reclassification of land of the Uncompangre project, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H.R. 3951. A bill to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Bitter Root irrigation district, Montana, and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Public Lands.
H.R. 3952. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Willwood irrigation district and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3953. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3954. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of the District of Columbia of 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 3955. A bill to provide for the payment of Federal unemployment taxes into the Federal unemployment account to be available for the administration of unemployment compensation laws and public employment offices, and to return to the States the excess of such taxes over such administrative expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 3956. A bill to provide for the expansion of post-office facility at Tiffin, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating the volunteer workers and contributors of the Nation's community chests; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to revise the Agricul-tural Adjustment Act for the purpose of lowering the high cost of living; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose the federalization of the National Guard of the United States and the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia in whole or in part; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the Fresident and the Congress of the United States to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging the appointment of an Alaskan on the International Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Public Lands

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal taxes on the transportation of persons and property as each affects interisland transportation in Hawaii and transportation between Hawaii and the mainland United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 3957. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral rights; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 3958. A bill for the relief of Michael
 A. Perna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 H. R. 3959. A bill to provide for the read-

mission to citizenship of Mrs. Pepa Opalicki; to the Committee on the Judiclary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3960. A bill for the relief of Adam Zakielarcz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H.R. 3961. A bill for the relief of Lamia Abed Khalil El Abed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (by request):

H. R. 3962. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marek Halpern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3963. A bill for the relief of Edward Lee Ankerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H.R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Walter M. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Oteein Foxworth and children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 3966. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

419. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Resolution of Farmers Union Local 494, of Hawk Springs, Wyo., for support of H. R. 113, providing for farm telephones through the REA; to the Committee on Agriculture.

420. Also, resolution of Farmers Union Local 494, of Hawk Springs, Wyo., endorsing the Missouri Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works,

421. By Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois: Petition of the Council of the City of Harvey, Ill., urging the Congress to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

422. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, asking all Members of Congress from Massachusetts to exert their influence to effect the unification of all of the counties in Eire to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

423. Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, asking the Congress to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending before it; to the Committee on the Judicions.

424. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging unification of all the counties of Eire; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

425. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of the Dorchester County Medical Society, going on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

426. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of 38 residents of Fairview and Cliffside Park, N. J., urging the repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

427. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John F. Reilly, grand knight, St. Augustine Council, Knights of Columbus, Stamford, Conn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enacting into law the McMahon-Johnson bill, S. 496, and thereby demonstrating sincerity and devotion to the welfare of all citizens of the United States, and particularly the children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

428. Also, petition of William M. Skipp, M. D., Mahoning County Medical Society, Youngstown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution concerning the federalization of medicine, and opposing any type of compulsory health insurance as proposed in the bills S. 5, H. E. 345, and H. R. 783; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

429. Also, petition of George Drennan, M. D., Morgan County Medical Society, Jacksonville, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution opposing the enactment of any legislation that would provide compulsory or national health insurance or any part of socialized medical care in any form; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

430. Also, petition of Francis Williams, chairman, Louisiana Ports Survey Commission, New Orleans 12, La., asking for support of several bills having for their purpose the rehabilitation and modernization of the equipment of the Federal Barge Lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

431. Also, petition of Mrs. Anna C. Finch and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

432. Also, petition of Mrs. Helena E. Roby and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

433. Also, petition of Alfred G. Alexander and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

434. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

435. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Vernon and others, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting

passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

436. Also, petition of H. Caine and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

437. Also, petition of Mrs. Ida J. Wallace and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

438. Also, petition of Mrs. Alice D. Kenney and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

439. Also, petition of Mrs. F. H. Godfrey and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

440. Also, petition of Mrs. Z. V. Dyson and others, Orlo Vista, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

441. Also, petition of Dr. J. R. Leatherman and others, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

442. Also, petition of Mabel M. Hand and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

443. Also, petition of Mrs. R. A. Hanson and others, Holly Hill, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

444. Also, petition of George I. Brazier and others, Orlanda, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means,

445. Also, petition of Grace E. Major and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 1949

(Legislative day of Friday, March 18, 1949)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, grant us, we beseech Thee, the lowly heart purged of pride and self-seeking, which is the only temple that can contain the Infinite. Enrich our lives with the grace of gratitude, for we come to the day's beginning with the song in our hearts: "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits."

We bless Thee for all Thy bounties, new every morning; for the glories of the world in which we live, for the work Thou hast given us to do and the strength with which to do it, the lessons Thou hast set us to learn in Thy great school of discipline. Amid all the masquerades of error and the sophistries of the cynical which seek to deceive our day, lead us in the way of truth. May we hold the faith by which we live in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life. We ask it all in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.